THE Teaching of Jesus ON Human Relations



JOHN S. HOYLAND

H853t

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON HUMAN RELATIONS

The Teaching of Jesus on Human Relations

BY
JOHN S. HOYLAND

Adapted for Use in America by Mary De Bardeleben

13910

LIBRARY OF
ed Theological Seminary
BT
2590
.F7
H69
1930
13,910

NASHVILLE, TENN.
COKESBURY PRESS
1930

C

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

PART I

THE THINGS WHICH SEPARATE

PAGE

The World Coming Closer 9

Religion 10

Political Factors 12

Economic Factors 17

Culture 23

Color 29

Ethical Factors 39

Summary of the Problem 51

PART II

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON HUMAN RELATIONS

I. Jewish Exclusiveness 59

II. The Book of Jonah 64

III. The Example of Christ 79

(1) In Regard to the Jewish Nationalists 80

(2) In Regard to the Roman Government . 85

(3) In Regard to the Samaritans . . 93

(4) Christ's Cosmopolitanism . . . 94

IV. Christ's Conception of God 97

(1) His Fatherhood 97

(2) Christ's Idea of God's Holiness . . 103

PAGE

V. Christ's Conception of the Kingdom of God . 110

VI. "Enthusiasm of Humanity," the Law of the Kingdom 117

VII. The Sovereign Value of the Kingdom of God . 122

VIII. The Universality of the Kingdom . . . 126

Summary of Christ's Program of Reconciliation 132

IX. Christ's Method of Friendship . . . 133

X. The Practical Application of the Method of Friendship 144

PART I
THE THINGS WHICH SEPARATE

PART I

THE THINGS WHICH SEPARATE

The World Coming Closer

Within the past two or three generations the conquest of nature, rendered possible by the application of scientific knowledge in a great variety of spheres, has drawn the world together into one close neighborhood. It is becoming day by day more obvious that this tendency is fraught not only with great possibilities of good for humanity, but also with terrible dangers. The more intimately the different races of men come into contact with each other the more menacing become the problems of human relationships. Closer contact means wider opportunities for friction, for jealousy and hatred, for conflict. Any one who has lived in intimate association with members of another race knows how fatally easy are the misundertanding, the lack of sympathy, the failure of good will, which are at the root of antagonism. He is driven back—if he is a Christian—perhaps a hundred times a day, to the demand for some superhuman force, the grace and love of Christ, which shall destroy all such antagonism and build the Kingdom of

God's Love wherein all races and nations shall dwell at peace.

Religion

Among those forces that make for hatred and antagonism between people, we find one of the strongest to be religion. No one who has visited the North of Ireland needs to be told that religion—the Christian religion—can form a vast reactionary influence, re-enforcing with fatal efficacy a hereditary cleavage. The traditional hostility of settler to Celt, embittered by dark memories of bloody rebellion and bloodier repression in the past, is intensely increased by the fact that the two sections of the population differ in religion as well as in race. Indeed, the religious difference between the native Irish and the imported Scottish stocks is far more marked and far more potent for evil than the racial difference.

The spirit of religious division was well expressed by Cromwell in his account of the infamous Drogheda massacre in 1649. "All the friars were knocked on the head promiscuously but two. The enemy were about 3,000 strong in the town. I believe we put to the sword the whole number of defendants. I do not think thirty of the whole number escaped with their lives. I am persuaded that this is a righteous

judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbued their hands in so much innocent blood; and that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood in the future. And now give me leave to say how it comes to pass that this work is wrought. It was set upon some of our hearts that a great thing should be done, not by power or might, but by the Spirit of God. And is it not so, clearly? That which caused your men to storm so courageously, it was the Spirit of God, who gave your men courage. And therefore it is good that God alone have all the glory." Of the similar massacre at Wexford, Cromwell says: "God, by an unexpected providence in his righteous justice, brought a just judgment upon them; causing them to become a prey to the soldier, who in their piracies had made preys of so many families, and now with their bloods to answer the cruelties which they had exercised upon the lives of divers poor Protestants."[1]

The type of mind which "gives God alone all the glory" in the case of massacres for which it has itself been directly responsible, and which regards such massacres as God's vengeance on the persecutors of its own co-religionists, is admirably typical of the fright-

[1] See Morley's "Oliver Cromwell," pp. 313 and 316.

ful harm which the wrong type of religion can do in accentuating racial antagonism. That spirit is unfortunately still alive in the world to-day.

In 1641 a Puritan preacher before the House of Commons declared, "Yet if his work be to revenge God's Church against Babylon, he is a blessed man that takes and dashes the little ones against the stones."[2]

Here we have the essence of that dark and bloody spirit of religious terrorism which is characteristic of the fanatical element in every faith, which has been responsible for every *jehad* since the beginning of history, and which, being readily fostered by and in its turn readily fostering interracial bitterness, produces, in contact with the race problem, such a concentrated spirit of devilish evil as may well make God himself despair. To overcome such a spirit of evil, philanthropy and patriotism alike are helpless. Some spiritual force is needed as strong as, and stronger than, this fanatical prejudice itself.

Political Factors

Political considerations occupy a very conspicuous place in the practical aspects of human relations.

[2] Morley, "Oliver Cromwell," p. 159.

In Roman Catholic Ireland political dependence on Great Britain has acted as a very powerful stimulus to the frictions between Celt and Saxon. In India the political ascendancy of the white race has had quite incalculable effect during the past generation in embittering the relations between English and Indian.

"In the United States the facts in regard to the exercise of the franchise by negroes in America can be understood only in the light of what occurred after the conclusion of the Civil War. Those concerned in the late rebellion—that is to say, the great majority of the white population—were excluded by Act of Congress (until the passing of the Amnesty Act of 1872) from voting and taking part in the government, while the emancipated slaves, ignorant and without political experience or even political ideas, were enfranchised. The legislatures in some States were controlled by the negro vote."[3]

Such a situation bred hatred and suspicion between the races and a fear of negro domination in politics that has become a part of the mental furnishings of many white people of the southern part of the United States, a fear which has been played upon by demagogues and

[3] Oldham, "Christianity and the Race Problem," p. 177.

cheap politicians, fomenting further misunderstanding and friction between the negro and the white. The situation will become more tense in proportion as the negro reaches a higher level of culture and education and attains a greater degree of racial self-consciousness.

Given education as a world-wide right of every race of men, there is no means of directly surmounting this political barrier. Wherever men's minds are enlightened, they will inevitably realize the fact of their political subjection, and this fact will establish a fatal barrier between dominant and subject people. There can be no hope for the union of humanity so long as one race is permitted, anywhere on earth, to retain permanent political dominance over any other self-conscious and thinking race.

The solution of the human problem in this aspect demands, as its essential prerequisite, a great act of spiritual adventure, of the adventure of freedom. That adventure is indeed essential to the work of reconciliation in any of its aspects. Success will never be attained in the effort to defeat the prejudices of color against color, or the hereditary antagonisms of varying stocks and religions and cultures, without a willingness to concede political liberty to both of the two rivals whom it is desired to unite. Whatever the practical difficulties, how-

ever great and imminent the risks of disaster or injustice, the venture must be made. It must be made, moreover, not in the spirit of niggardly cheese-paring, not as a concession extorted by agitation and coercion from a grudging and illiberal master, but as a gift gladly offered by friend to friend. If it is granted in this right spirit, the gift of liberty in itself involves relationships of mutual confidence and hearty good will which go far toward bringing into existence the atmosphere essential for the operation of those spiritual forces which we have already seen to be the only hope for the genuine solution of human problems.

But nothing short of a sacred enthusiasm for freedom for its own sake will ever enable an imperial race sufficiently to conquer its own selfish interests and prejudicies—its pride in its share in "the white man's burden"—to enable liberty to be thus generously conceded to a subject population.

Moreover, in the past it has constantly been remarked that peoples who have succeeded in vindicating their own liberty have begun to use that new-found liberty immediately and automatically in the attempt to oppress any other race which may be unfortunate enough to be under their power.

Although we fought a terrible war to make

"the world safe for democracy," Europe has not yet begun to learn the stern lessons which were blazoned before her in five years of bloody conflict and ghastly starvation. The first of all such lessons must surely be the plain fact that grim Nemesis attends any race which attempts to aggrandize itself at the expense of its neighbors. Yet the process of self-aggrandizement is still going merrily forward.

It must once more be repeated that nothing less than a radical change of heart, achieved through the influence of some overmastering spiritual force, can effect that radical transformation of ideals which alone can sweep these obstacles from the pathway of human progress. Mankind needs an enthusiasm for liberty which shall not only persuade dominant races freely and generously, and without counting the cost or shirking the risk, to grant self-determination to all races that are under their control, but shall also dissuade nations that have gained their freedom from taking revenge upon their former oppressors, or from using their new liberty to oppress others. A deep and enthusiastic belief is needed in the divine right, possessed by every race, freely to work out its own destiny as a unit in a world-commonwealth of peoples.

In the United States there has been a most

noteworthy contribution to the solution of the problem of the political basis of racial antagonism in the magnificent work which has for so long been going on amongst immigrants from European countries. As if by an automatic process the American environment, and the stimulus of the desire to be thought genuinely American, have succeeded in welding together not only into one homogeneous civilization, but even into one racial unity, the most adventurous spirits from a score of fiercely antagonistic peoples. In this wonderful achievement may be seen an earnest of that happy future when the ideal of international fellowship and the desire to be thought worthy of world citizenship shall have finally persuaded all men to sink their differences and to become the members of one universal brotherhood.

Economic Factors

Economic factors are of more sinister importance than is usually supposed in perpetuating cleavages. It has been plausibly maintained that all, or almost all, the great wars of the world since the days of Queen Elizabeth have in reality been undertaken by the various nations for commercial objects and the control of trade. Economic considerations have been mainly responsible for the closing of Australia

to Indian immigration. The same considerations have had much evil influence upon the relationships of the white and Indian races in South Africa. Addressing the British race, Rabindranath Tagore says (in his "Nationalism"): "In most of your colonies you only admit them (Asiatics) on condition of their accepting the menial position of hewers of wood and drawers of water. Either you shut your doors against the aliens or reduce them into slavery."

Again, the results of the economic penetration of the Japanese in California have so embittered the relations between the United States and Japan as to create a situation fraught with danger for the future peace of the world. On the one side, the Americans declare that the presence of the Japanese tends inevitably to lower the standard of living and to cheapen the rates of wages in the community as a whole. On the other side, the Japanese point out with justice that their industry and the simplicity of their life should be regarded as virtues to be rewarded rather than as vices to be punished. If it be maintained that they should remain in their own country to practice these virtues, they are perfectly right in replying that the population of Japan has so far outstripped the na-

tional food supply as to render essential the emigration of large numbers of her people.

The attitude of the people of British Columbia to the immigrants from North India (chiefly Sikhs, members of the finest of all the Indian races) led shortly before the war to a state of inflamed exasperation in India which seriously embarrassed those who were responsible for peace and order in the anxious months after the war broke out. Here again the friction was almost entirely due to the economic considerations which induced the authorities of British Columbia, backed up as they were by the public opinion of the colony, to exclude the would-be immigrants.

We have in this economic problem a hard practical aspect of human relations. It demands for its solution some line of approach which will render it possible to persuade the rank and file of the laboring classes in any given country deliberately to forego the economic advantages of isolation and to admit aliens to competition with themselves in what they have regarded as their own exclusive preserves. They must do so, moreover, in spite of the fact that the presence of these aliens will undoubtedly involve a lowering of the wage scale and of the ordinary standards of life. The problem, so stated, may well appear an

absolutely hopeless one. Yet we have only to remember the urgency of the situation which arose in California, as a result of the appearance of this problem, to be persuaded that the welfare of mankind demands that, at least, some definite and earnest attempt should be made toward the discovery of a solution.

We have need here of some force potent enough to convert the ordinary hard-headed "man in the street" from his regard for his own pocket and his interest in his own comfort to a working and practical regard for the well-being of other peoples. He must be persuaded to vote for his own ousting—for this is what the matter comes to—by a cheaper and more efficient rival. There is no need to insist that, if this end is to be achieved, some factor must be introduced of quite exceptional efficacy in the work of casting out the prejudices and self-interests of mankind.

It is unfortunately true that any attempt to uplift a backward and despised race may carry with it the necessity of building up their economic status in a way that is likely to bring into speedy operation those economic factors in prejudice with which we are now dealing. Thus, in order to uplift the outcastes of India, it is essential that they be taught trades that shall render them economically independent of

the caste-superiors who at present, generally speaking, oppress and exploit them. But the teaching of such trades will, in itself, bring about economic competition between the outcastes who are thus being uplifted and the hereditary caste-guilds which from time immemorial have held a monopoly of those trades. Thus the feeling against the outcastes will be yet further embittered by the economic factor.

Yet this fact should not for a moment cause us to hesitate with regard to the task of rendering the outcastes economically independent of the caste system. The work must be pushed ahead as swiftly and wisely as possible, in the belief that the new spiritual forces of which we are in search will be discovered and will make their influence felt in time to counter the danger of accentuated bitterness. In the interests of the outcastes the venture of faith must be made.

Booker Washington, the American negro leader, gave his life to the uplifting of his people through the teaching of economic independence. "The individual who can do something that the world wants done will, in the end, make his way regardless of race. The man who learns at Tuskegee to build and repair wagons and carts is regarded as a benefactor by both races in the community where

he goes. The people with whom he lives and works are going to think twice before they part with such a man."[4] All this is profoundly true for other countries besides the United States. The sturdy courage with which Booker Washington fought for technical education for his people, often definitely against their own wishes, and the resolute determination with which he built up his great training institution and sent out his thousands of trained mechanics and artisans are worthy of the highest admiration from those who realize what incalculable mountains of prejudice and obstruction have to be cleared away before a despised and ostracized race such as the outcastes of India, or the Kaffirs in South Africa, or the negroes in the United States—can be raised as a group to a position of self-respect and independence.

Yet, as we have seen, this essential raising of the economic status of depressed peoples—eminently right and desirable though it is—must of necessity lead to seriously increased friction. That this is not merely a distant fear is shown by the fact that many of the fierce racial riots such as occurred in Chicago and East St. Louis are said to have been partly due to economic causes, to the fear of the

[4] "Up from Slavery," p. 193.

whites that the blacks are slowly ousting them from their employment.

Culture

We may now proceed to examine that aspect of the problem which is concerned with types of civilization and general culture. In the past there have been many glaring instances of friction inflamed by the parallel existence in one environment of divergent or antagonistic forms of civilization. An extreme instance may be found in the relations of the white settlers in Tasmania to their aboriginal neighbors. The latter were found to be, or were supposed to be, of so low and bestial a type of humanity that it was finally resolved to kill them all off—a resolution which, to the eternal shame of the Anglo-Saxon race, was duly carried into effect. A less glaring instance may be found in the hatred aroused amongst the Poles of Posen by the imposition upon them of the German system of education. The whole record of the contact of European peoples with the "child races" demonstrates how fatal to ordinary ideas of justice, decency, and fair dealing is a situation in which peoples differing widely in their stage of culture and civilization are brought into close contact. "What a well-informed writer (Merivale, "Colonization,"

Lect. 18), by no means unduly sentimental, calls the 'wretched details of the ferocity and treachery which have marked the conduct of civilized men in their relation with savages' form one of the most painful chapters in modern history; and the more painful from the frequent evidence it gives of benevolent intentions, and even beneficent efforts, on the part of the rulers of the superior race.'' [5]

The history of the relations between the whites and the American Indians (especially in the matter of the silver mines), of ''blackbirding'' and gin-trading in the South Seas, and of other similar dark episodes in the record of the expansion of Europe demonstrates how tragic may be the influence of this factor in estrangements.

There can be no doubt that the wholesale super-imposing of a European type of civilization upon the ancient indigenous culture of India accounts for a great deal of the friction still existing in that country. In education, in political ideals, in amusements, in manner of life, above all in their vast and intricate system of law and government, the British supplanted an exceedingly ancient and relatively much simpler type of culture. There has

[5] Sidgwick, ''Elements of Politics,'' p. 321.

been a very general cry from Indian statesmen and thinkers for a return, if this be possible, to many of the features of the old culture—the old patriarchal village government (with the great simplification of legal machinery which it would insure), the old asceticism, the old manner of dress, the old Sanskrit learning, the old religion, the old strictness of ceremonial observance. Exaggerated as are some features of the modern Hindu reaction, the fact remains that with the coming of self-consciousness in India there has come also a new enthusiasm for the old culture of the country, and hence a new resentment against the British for the changes which they have made. This phenomenon is typical of the fact which we are considering—the fact that divergences of culture and civilization may greatly accentuate racial cleavage.

It is clear that in this question of culture-loyalty we are dealing with factors which lie beyond the reach of logical treatment. Deep primitive instincts are involved—loyalties that are not so much irrational as beyond the sphere of reason. The enthusiasm which can be aroused for an ancient culture, though it is perhaps ill-suited for survival in the modern world, or for an ancient language, though it may be archaic and clumsy, or even for an old book, though it may be out of date and reac-

tionary, is a real working fact. It is a force which must be met, not by scorn and antagonism, but by sympathy and tact, in order that it may be turned to the service of humanity as a whole instead of to the service of hatred and disunion. To this end we need, as in relation to all the other factors in the human problem, a spiritual force even more deep-going and efficacious in its control over the instincts and passions of mankind than this force of culture-loyalty which we are now considering.

Closely allied with the factor of general culture is the factor of history. We speak of "traditional enmities" between peoples, which have become chronic owing to the persistence with which they have broken out again and again. There cannot be the slightest doubt that if, throughout its past history, a certain attitude has been consistently adopted by one race toward another, the knowledge of this fact in itself constitutes an immense incentive to the adoption of the same attitude in the present also. The study of history in elementary and even secondary schools is too often deliberately designed to keep alive ancient enmities, under the influence of the fatally reactionary idea that racial, national, and sectional patriotism is fostered thereby. It would, of course, be far

better to teach no history at all than to teach it in this way.

The great European war has given convincing proof of the vast tragedy to which the inculcation of such false patriotism may lead.

In the modern democratic world no military caste, however all-pervasive its influence and autocratic its power may be, can hope to carry through a great war without the existence, in the mass of the nation, of the conviction both that the national cause is morally just and that it is supported by the "logic of history." It was the German fear of the brutal and barbarous Slav, and the carefully nurtured belief that a secular and inevitable enmity is fatally predestined to exist between the Teutonic and Slavonic races, which—more than anything else—rendered it possible for the militarist caste in Germany to secure the adherence of the proletariat to the war. Similarly the "secular antagonism" of Bulgar to Turk and Greek, again carefully nurtured by the national leaders, led to the first and second phases of the Balkan War of 1912-13.

In India, it is at least open to doubt whether the teaching of history, as at present conducted, does not lead to estrangement rather than to the much-to-be-desired reconciliation between Hindus and Mussulmans. For the study of In-

dian history involves the detailed remembrance of such a dreary series of bloody conflicts and outrages perpetrated by the one "race" or the other as would be excellently calculated to bring into existence the tradition of a secular enmity between these two great sections of the Indian population, even if no such tradition at present existed.

There is little doubt that school histories have done much in the past to keep alive animosity between the North and the South in the United States and between various countries of Europe. In such cases it is clear that the actual study of history, even apart from the bias which may be given to it by false ideas of patriotism, may be capable of the very greatest harm to the cause of reconciliation. The past has been perpetually stained by strife and hatred. The future, if mankind is to progress, must be freed, as far as may be possible, even from the remembrance of those strifes and hatreds. Yet it is undoubtedly needful that the present should study the records of the past; for without such study it cannot learn the lessons, and gain vicariously the experience, which shall enable it in the future to avoid the mistakes and tragedies of other generations.

How is the difficulty to be met?

Much is being done; yet much remains to be

done in the revision of the history textbooks taught in schools, a revision aimed at ridding them of records and memories that perpetuate past strife and outrage and at eliminating the grosser features of that disastrous cult of false patriotism which has become such a menace to the world.

Yet this cannot be enough. For the traditions of these secular hatreds are fixed so deep in the heart of a race that for generations mere schoolroom reform, though eminently useful, must be insufficient of itself to cast out the evil results of ancient enmity. If these malign influences are successfully to be combated and overthrown, we need a radical elimination of the sinister propensities and characteristics which past antagonism has planted deep in the national mentality. The heavily scored traces of, perhaps, thirty generations of war, oppression, and outrage must be wiped clean away.

Clearly in this task also we need a spiritual force and a force strong enough to effect a fundamental transformation in human nature itself.

Color

But the most persistent and incorrigible of all the sentimental factors of antagonism—a factor which derives half its importance from

the fundamental physiological differentiation which it is supposed to denote—is that of color.

Color has from the beginning of history constituted an almost insurmountable barrier between individuals and peoples. The Sanskrit word for caste (varna) means "color"; and there is little doubt that the Hindu caste system, which has throughout the ages of Indian history constituted such a fatal drawback both to national integration and to the emancipation of the individual, was in origin a color bar, devised by the white Aryan invaders to keep at a safe distance the black Dravidians and negritos. In this instance the baneful effects of the color bar have endured and crystallized into a vast system of social tyranny, which on the one hand has debarred untold millions from the right of manhood, and on the other hand has vitiated, by its stifling atmosphere of exclusiveness and self-esteem, the spiritual life of untold millions more. It is one of the healthiest elements in the national movement now sweeping over India that that movement has definitely declared war against untouchability, the most disastrous feature of the caste system.

It is not uncommon nowadays to meet with the opinion, generally expressed by people who have had little experience with the realties of life in communities where white and colored

races live side by side, that color prejudice is an affair merely of differing stages of culture and of lower and higher standards of life. "Race prejudice that is so largely founded on sheer considerations of color is bound to decay, if and when the races of dark color succeed in displaying, on the average, such qualities of mind as will enable them to compete with the whites on equal terms, in a world which is coming more and more to include all climates." So says one authority. But there can be little doubt that such a view is unduly, even absurdly, optimistic. Color prejudice is so deeply rooted an instinct in millions of men and women, and forms an instinct so entirely beyond the control of any logical considerations, that to those who have felt its force and known its blind and ruthless malevolence there is something almost grotesque in the idea that any spread of enlightened "qualities of mind" can defeat such an enemy.

There are many people, especially women, with whom contact with persons of a different color produces symptoms akin to those of actual physical nausea.[6] It must not be supposed

[6] Compare the well-known case of the African explorer who, after living for many years amongst negroes alone, was affected by a feeling of physical nausea whenever he caught sight of his own white skin.

that it is only the whites who feel this repulsion toward the yellows, the browns, or the blacks. The feeling is in some cases genuinely reciprocated. There are, for instance, many Indians who feel a genuine sensation of physical repulsion at the sight of the "sickly pallor" of the European's skin.

The lengths to which the application of a rigid color bar is carried in the Southern part of the United States are shown, for instance, in the "Jim Crow" cars and in the branding as a "nigger" of any one who has the least drop of negro blood in his veins.

It is true that the color problem in America is complicated by the relics of the fundamental social and economic distinction between slave and free which existed before the Civil War and is re-enforced by strongly held convictions regarding the looser moral standards of the negroes. But, while allowing full weight to these secondary considerations, any impartial observer must still acknowledge that the problem of the color bar between black and white, as it exists in the United States (and also—for instance—in South Africa), constitutes an immense and, at present, insurmountable barrier in the way of the progress of racial reconciliation.

The danger which results to the community

as a whole from the existence of that color bar, with its kindred prejudices and passions, may be judged from the nature of the outbursts of lynching which occur from time to time in various parts of the United States.

These lynchings are the most glaring of the outward and visible signs of the fundamental antipathy between white and black in the United States. The better spirits in the American nation are united in their belief that the race problem in this connection constitutes a terrible menace to the civilization of the country.

The following from the *Literary Digest* of April 12, 1930, is indicative of the fact that the governments of the States in the Southern part of the United States are getting the lynch evil well in hand, but it also reflects a condition that calls for strenuous efforts in the molding of a stronger anti-lynching public opinion.

Under the title, "A Defeat of Judge Lynch," the article reads:

"Martin Maryland was in the dock at Montgomery, charged with a crime against a white woman. A jury of white men faced him. Outside and in the courtroom were stationed soldiers sent there by the Governor of Alabama to see that justice was done, that lynch law was not invoked. All the protection the State

could provide was given to the negro. So Martin Maryland had the chance to establish his innocence to the satisfaction of judge, jury, and prosecutor. It was a plain case of mistaken identity, we read, and the solicitor announced that he could not conscientiously ask for conviction. The jury promptly brought in a verdict of acquittal, and Martin Maryland went forth a free man. The State had, perhaps, saved a life, and, certainly, it had saved its honor. And two Alabama papers are glad that justice was administered, that Martin Maryland lives, and that Judge Lynch had no opportunity to press for private vengeance, which, in this case, would have been wreaked against an innocent man.

"'The hapless victim of circumstance,' observes the Montgomery *Advertiser,* 'had a close call, but not a closer call than the honor of the State. It is greatly to the credit of the State that this man was given adequate protection and the ordinary guaranties of a fair trial so meticulously enforced in this case.'

"There is nothing to brag about in the acquittal, observes the Birmingham *Age-Herald.* For, 'after all, the doing of justice under the law should be so much a matter of course that the mere color of the defendant would not figure in the adjudication. But that,' we are told,

'is a principle which is sometimes upheld with difficulty, and it is the fact that in this particular case it was maintained so strikingly that Alabamians find something to stir and stiffen them in their devotion to fair play and a square deal for negroes in and outside the courtroom.' And we read: 'So, in having a judge and a solicitor of this caliber, Montgomery County was enabled to prove that the law can be administered without discrimination. The only fly in the ointment is that justice was done under the protection of armed militiamen. That argues that we have considerable ground to cover before we shall have freed ourselves of the ugly shadow of lynch law. And until that time comes our gratification in the splendid triumph of legal equality at Montgomery must be sobered by a sense of frustration. Unless and until we are sure that no alien force can thrust itself into our courts and enforcement of law, we must remain conscious of a yawning gap in our life. Thoughtful Southerners have reason to feel that a bridge is being rapidly erected over this chasm. But they will wait until passageway over it is the only path before they are ready to rejoice in the redemption of this section from the blood lust of the mob.' "

It is worth noticing that racial prejudice is

often largely founded on wholly illogical deductions drawn from the hasty observance of a few bad specimens of another race and involving the neglect of a vast majority of ordinary individuals. That is how all the most hostile portraits of national types are drawn. "Some people, if they see a single drunken man in the streets during a visit to Edinburgh, will immediately form a generalization in their minds and imagine the drunken Scotsman as the national type. Americans hear of a negro assaulting a white woman, and a generalized negro at once comes to birth in their imaginations, a racial type much addicted to that sort of crime. Statistics are of no avail against these products of the heated imagination. Nine hundred and ninety-nine negroes who behave well count as nothing in the balance against one negro who behaves ill. It is proved, we believe, that assaults on women by negroes are proportionately fewer than assaults by any other of the races inhabiting America. But racial generalizations are proof-proof."[7]

It is clear that where color prejudice runs as deep and strong as it does in the Southern United States, and in other parts of the world, some regenerating agency of quite extraor-

[7] *New Statesman*, December 6, 1919.

dinary efficacy is needed to save from anarchy and disaster any community which has to find room for both white and black within its borders.

Yet there can be no doubt at all that the color problem has been solved, and solved thoroughly and effectually, both by individuals and by large groups and communities of people.

In the United States there have been many noble men and women who have been themselves utterly free from this poisonous color prejudice, and have even of their own accord identified themselves with the life of the colored people, generously devoting time and effort to their uplift for long periods of years.

It is true that men and women of this stamp, who have given themselves to the noble work of overthrowing race and color barriers, and to the uplift of the despised colored race, have often had to face bitter opposition, obloquy, and ostracism. But their spirit of service has enabled them to champion the cause of the negroes not merely from the position of easy, armchair philanthropy, but from the actual standpoint of the negroes among whom they lived, and thereby to do noble work for social reconciliation.

In the case of some European nationalities, notably the French and the Portuguese, the

color prejudice appears to have very little force. These races intermarry freely with colored populations; and there seems to be little or no public opinion against such unions, no social penalty being inflicted on those who enter upon them.

The Anglo-Saxon race, however, is fatally susceptible to color prejudice. This is the more to be regretted since it is this race, far more than any other, which in the modern world has to deal, and to deal tactfully and wisely, with colored populations.

Much of the suffering and indignity which Indians have had to undergo in South Africa, and which of recent years had contributed a potent influence to racial estrangement and political unrest in India, has been due to the fact that in South Africa the unfortunate Indian has become the victim of a color prejudice far more intense than that existing between Indians and English in India.

An instinctive antipathy also exists between the white and yellow races, as may be seen, for instance, from the "Yellow Peril" scare of several years ago.[8]

---

[8] Compare the striking instance of the Chinese Labor poster recorded in Graham Wallas' "Human Nature in Politics," p. 108.

The color bar is a fact to be faced in the modern world. It stands for one of those intensely powerful, because intensely illogical, prejudices whose influence is often far more disastrous for civilization than that of any of the more reasoned and plausible aspects of reaction. Such instinctive prejudices are only to be overcome by a master instinct, a force rising out of the subconscious depths of human nature, strong enough to defeat the evil of anti-social instinct and to replace it by a good social instinct. Rational argument is of little avail as a counter-force to genuine color prejudice. What is needed is "the expulsive power of a new affection"—some spiritual force transforming bitterness and hatred into an active impulse toward co-operation and friendship.

Ethical Factors

Finally we come to the most baffling and intangible, and perhaps also the most formidable, of all the barriers which separate. Peoples are diversified, not only by religion, political relationships, economic status, culture, history, tradition, and color; but also by something far subtler and deeper—a factor which for this very reason is far more difficult to gauge and overcome than those we have already considered.

Race is divided from race by fundamental differences in ethical endowment. Their members act differently in relation to the same set of circumstances. Their moral character is diverse.

The "average man" has, from the dawn of history, unconsciously borne witness to this fact by the use of those general condemnations of the character of aliens against which Burke, and many another great lover of humanity, have protested in vain. "All Cretans are liars." "All Englishmen are brutal and overbearing." "All Japanese are untrustworthy in business." "All Jews are usurious sharks." "All Americans worship the almighty dollar." "All Germans are would-be baby-killers." "All negroes are shiftless and immoral." These and the like cheap generalizations represent a fundamental and tragic reality—an ethical cleavage between peoples and nations which will be far harder for mankind to bridge than any physical or economic or cultural cleavage.

For it is a real fact that one race differs from another race—sometimes very widely—in moral character and ethical outlook. Sometimes the difference is small; in other cases it is immense. The average response given in action by the average representative of one peo-

ple to a given stimulus differs very materially from the average response given by the average representative of another people to the same stimulus. For instance, the response of the average Englishman to the offer of a bribe differs *toto cælo* from the response of the average Levantine. The response of the average Pathan to a personal insult differs *toto cælo* from the response of the average Bengali. The response of the untamed head-hunter of Borneo to the opportunity of catching his hereditary enemy off his guard differs *toto cælo* from the response of the Polish Jew.

It may be true that, to a considerable extent, these moral differences are due to, and may be modified by, training and environment.[9] Yet, broadly and practically speaking, a fundamental ethical diversity does exist. In spite of all efforts at reconciliation, the average member of any given race will still continue, whenever he honestly faces facts, to class the members of any other given race indiscriminately together as "impossible people" (if he is given to polite modes of speech), or as "dirty swine" (if he is in the habit of plain speaking). No doubt this is a very regrettable fact. It is easy to condemn the benighted prejudice which ren-

[9] As is forcibly maintained by Dr. Oakesmith in his "Race and Nationality."

ders such an all-but-universal habit of mind possible. But if reform is to be effected, it is essential for us first of all to recognize that there is a solid foundation for the prejudice in question—namely, the fact that the wide divergence existing between the moral inheritance and outlook of any two peoples renders the lines of action adopted by individuals, under the same circumstances, absolutely disparate. Hence the general conscience of the one will automatically condemn a line of action (and the morality inspiring that line of action) which is characteristic in the case of the other.

That races should so differ in their ethical outlook, in their fundamental conceptions of right and wrong and in the way they carry those conceptions into action, is in no way surprising if one considers the manifold factors which contribute toward such ethical differentiation. Climate, religion, culture, education, past history, political circumstances, home life, economic environment, these and a hundred other forces combine to make the moral standards which the average Englishman (for instance) applies to consider the rightness or wrongness of any course of action entirely different from those which the average Chinese (again for instance) is in the habit of applying. We have

only to consider these and the like factors in detail, one by one, to be profoundly surprised that the differences in ethical outlook are not a thousandfold more marked than they are.

In this connection, if in no other, facts must be resolutely faced. Sentiment will betray us here more certainly than in any other part of our consideration. Nothing will avail for the great purposes of reconciliation save some solution which shall suffice to meet the realities of the case in all their uncompromising awkwardness. It is not of the slightest use to maintain that all races do, in fact, have the same moral standards and the same characteristic manner of responding to any given temptation or opportunity of wrongdoing. Nor is it of any avail to maintain that what one regards as mean and despicable conduct is regarded as such by all others. Nations do differ in conception of duty, in sense of honor, in estimate of right and wrong, in the emphasis which is laid on specific virtues and specific vices. No good will be done by an attitude of mind which, under the influence of a sentimental universalism, attempts to slur over such real and vital distinctions. The existence of this ethical divergence —far more than the existence of any physical or cultural or economic divergence—makes for lack of mutual comprehension and for definite

antagonism. But sentiment will never achieve the bridging of the gap.

It is common to hear a certain type of Englishman complain that Indians have no sense of honor with regard to money or truth-telling. It is as common to hear Indians complain that Englishmen are insufferably arrogant and intolerant. Asked to write out an Indian version of the Parable of the Good Samaritan, a student showed up the following rendering: "Once upon a time a Baniya who was returning from a bazaar with a great sum of money was robbed of his money and beaten and thrown into a ditch by highwaymen. There he was lying, groaning and crying. A lawyer was passing along the road on a bicycle. The Baniya could see him and called to him for assistance. The pleader said that he had to attend to an important case, so he was compelled to go there, and had not that been the case, he would certainly have helped him. Further the pleader said to him that he possessed some money which he was ready to give to the Baniya. The Baniya took the money and said, 'O, rupees, what shall I do with you?' After some time an outcaste potter riding on an ass was passing that way. When he saw the Baniya lying there, he at once went to him, gave him the necessary help, and took him on one of his asses to the town where

was a dispensary. The potter asked the doctor in charge of the government hospital, who was a European, to treat him. He said to him, 'You bloody swine, why do you come here?' and calling a servant told him to drive the potter out of the compound. The poor potter with the Baniya went to a private doctor, who promised to give help to the Baniya if he had some hope of getting money from him. The Baniya had two rupees (which the pleader had given him), and also the potter had three rupees. In all they had five rupees, which they gave to the doctor, who made the Baniya all right. Out of the four men, the pleader, the European doctor, the private doctor, and the potter, God was highly pleased with the potter."

Here we have a particular instance of the truth that in India the European is generally regarded, at any rate amongst the educated classes, as a monster of arrogance, violence, and hard-heartedness.

The American negro and the American white man hold each other in much the same light as do the Indian and the Englishman.

Such instances show clearly that here we have a yawning gulf between races which will be exceedingly hard to bridge. Indeed, it can only be bridged by a mutual sympathy which shall be willing to recognize the existence of

divergent standards, to make allowances for them, and to treat differences of conduct with a large-hearted tolerance. Such a spirit of sympathy cannot be developed without that contact and friendship of individuals on the right plane which it is often so desperately hard to obtain.

Thus it comes about that each race condemns the other for its lack of those virtues which appear to itself—and rightly—to be of such paramount importance.

We are not dealing with theories of either the causation or the cure of such antagonisms. We are merely concerned with the facing of facts. One such fact is this—and no amount of sentiment will camouflage it—that, generally speaking, English and Indian find it exceedingly hard to see any good in each other. The average member of each race regards the average member of the other as an impossible person to associate with. For the ethical outlook of the one is radically different from that of the other.

These things being so, it is needful for those who are working for reconcilation—having rigorously excluded sensitiveness together with all other forms of sentiment from their minds—to recognize in the first place that these moral

differences are simply the stored-up fruit of racial experience.

In America the conditions of slavery trained the negro in qualities of humility, obedience, and meekness, developing, in addition, his beautiful native qualities of fidelity amid trying circumstances, gratitude, forgiveness, patience, and humor. Whereas the same conditions developed in his master, the white man, those native tendencies inherited from his Anglo-Saxon past—a past in which men have for ages been governed, not by personal rule, but by an elaborate system of law, depending to a very marked degree on the conscious co-operation of each individual citizen. The practical working of this system has, of necessity, demanded the development on a wide scale of certain social rather than personal virtues (if the distinction may be allowed), such as loyalty, public spirit, truthfulness, honesty, efficiency, order, self-control, and self-sacrifice for the community.

In each case the appreciation of the one set of virtues dulls the capacity for appreciation of the other set and throws a more glaring light on the absence in the other race of what itself regards as so important. Hence mutual exasperation, intolerance, and embittered racial antagonism.

A multitude of instances might be taken demonstrating this divergence of ethical outlook between other races than these we have already dealt with. Good humor and hospitality in the Irish, discipline and thoroughness in the German, industry and business capacity in the Jew, patience and honesty in the Chinese, are virtues inherited in part at any rate from the racial history and built up by long training in a special environment. They are virtues invaluable in themselves, but carrying also in every case their counter-balancing deficiencies —deficiencies which often loom so large to our view that we are apt to forget the existence of the positive virtues to which they correspond.

Clearly it is essential that there should be developed, on a large scale, a broad-mindedness as detached and tolerant as that of Aristotle when he laid down his great law of the ethical "golden mean." Only the general spread of a sympathy and a patience quite beyond anything in our present experience will avail to bridge this yawning chasm. For the most serious feature of the ethical aspect of antagonism is this, that in reconciliation in this sphere, conscience—at any rate the average man's conscience—fights not for us, but against us.

Conscience, our inborn sense of right and

wrong, our inherited equipment of moral ideals, says to the members of each race, "Come ye out, and be ye separate from these accursed." Tolerance and sympathy seem at times to the average man, not only irksome, but morally wrong. They involve a pandering to what is evil, a slurring over of the sacred and eternal distinction between that which is forever right and that which is forever wrong, an unnatural mingling of the sheep with the goats, of light with darkness.

This may appear to be an over-statement; but it is not so. To many men of proved good will toward humanity as a whole, the bridging of any given international gap will appear to involve a moral—or rather immoral—compromise which they abhor, a willingness to condone faults which they hate with their whole souls, a sacrifice of principle to "sentiment" which is to them worse than blasphemy.

Let us give such men their due. They are honest and conscientious. They are men of honor and upright principles. They prize certain very valuable qualities with a distinguished loyalty. It is true that they are intolerant of other men's vices and unappreciative of other men's virtues; but at any rate they stand for a certain clear moral ideal, which they refuse to compromise.

The good is always the worst enemy of the best. The integrity and single-minded honesty of such men is probably as dangerous to the cause of reconciliation as the more obvious malignities of color, creed, economic rivalry, and traditions of ancient strife. Their very excellence, the sterling nature of their moral idealism, makes them a deadly foe to the union of humanity.

We thus find ourselves in need of some force that will convince good men that their goodness is not sufficient, that the dictates of their conscience and their common sense are tragically misleading them, that their whole scheme of ethical values and ideals is not only incomplete, but is dangerously reactionary. We need something cogent enough to convince such men that jeopardized by this incomplete and reactionary ethical outlook of theirs is not only the well-being of all humanity (since the future of civilization depends on the swift elmination of existing antagonisms), but also the possibility of building up a new universal conscience, a new world-wide system of moral ideals, which, while embracing the ethical contributions of all peoples, shall sacrifice no truth already comprehended by any people.

Here indeed is a vast spiritual need. For nothing but a transcendant spiritual force can

ever achieve such a wholesale "transvaluation of moral values."

Summary of the Problem

We have now completed our analysis of the more striking aspects of the human problem as it exists in the modern world. The sum total of the matter is this, that peoples are divided from each other by barriers, intellectual, economic, and above all ethical, which are so steep and high as to defy all present efforts toward union.

It must further be noticed, as a sinister factor deeply affecting the whole situation, that the more closely diverse groups have to live together under unfair conditions, the more bitter become their antagonisms. They are like two individuals suffering from incompatibility of temperament, who get along very well as long as they are apart, but fall into hopeless quarreling as soon as they are brought together.

Those who have merely for a few weeks or months toured through other lands, and have seen much to admire in the course of their travels, are apt to return full of fine contempt for all the concentrated prejudice which they have met, amongst those long resident abroad,

regarding national failings, incompatibilities, and antagonisms.

But the problem has to be lived with to be understood. They are few and stalwart souls who can for a long period live in the midst of an alien environment and an alien population, whether the people among which they are resident be "lower" or "higher" than their own, without feeling rise and develop within them an instinctive antipathy to the people and the culture and the moral atmosphere around them.

When facts are fairly faced contact on a large scale means almost inevitably antagonism. Such antagonism may be either open or concealed. If it is concealed, it is perhaps more dangerous than if it is open. From the earliest dawn of history it has been so, and there are no definite indications that the tendency is losing its force under modern conditions.

We are thus faced with the existence of apparently insurmountable barriers, which only become more insuperable as divergent peoples come into closer contact with each other. It is indeed possible plausibly to represent the fruit of the vast increase in the intercommunication of races which was brought about during the nineteenth century as merely a vast exasperation of enmities throughout the whole earth.

For it cannot be maintained that in the extension of trade, and of the facilities for intercommunication generally, we have a solution for the problem of antagonisms. The general effect of such trade and such increase of communication has been a tremendous growth in the opportunities of friction. Economic rivalry, as we have seen, is a powerful factor in antagonism. The manner in which Japanese commercial expansion has fostered racial estrangement in the great cities of China, or in those of the Pacific slope of the United States, shows that it is vain to expect a solution of the human problem through commercial relationships. They merely provide fuel for the flames of rivalry and exasperation. It must be something very different from trade expansion, from the exploitation of each other's profitable markets, that is to bring peoples really together into a bond of brotherhood.

Nor can it be maintained that the solution we need will be found in that call to universal brotherhood which comes from the international labor movement. For, as has been already suggested, this movement can only achieve any genuine degree of impartiality when it is removed from actual contact with the race problem. Once such contact is established, as in California between Americans and

Japanese, or in British Columbia between Canadians and Sikhs, or in Chicago and Cardiff between black and white, race friction of an acute type is certain to result. Economic rivalry, the fear of lessening wages through cheap competition, the anticipation of the lowering of the standard of living, co-operate with fatal certainty in bringing about conflicts.

Something very much stronger than labor solidarity is needed to solve the problem, as may incidentally be seen in the fact that it is the Labor Government of Australia which, in spite of the great loss of prosperity involved, has been most consistently unbending with regard to the exclusion from its territories of Indian or other non-white laborers.

Again, it may perhaps be maintained that the force we are seeking, though it must clearly be a spiritual force (since the most formidable obstacles it has to encounter are psychological and instinctive rather than material, intellectual, or logical), yet need not necessarily be a religious force. Some may argue that the abstract idea of liberty—in itself of course a fundamentally spiritual conception—will be sufficient in time to persuade mankind to allow each several race to work out its own destiny in its own way. May not racial reconciliation

best be achieved by breeding amongst all mankind a divine enthusiasm for liberty?

Were the world divided into a patchwork of absolutely self-contained and homogeneous areas, the idea of liberty, followed everywhere whole-heartedly and with superhuman public spirit, might conceivably suffice to solve the problem. But unfortunately races overlap, and in many areas (for instance, in Transylvania, in Galacia, in Ulster, in the Southern United States) overlap to such a degree of inextricable complication as to make it absolutely impossible to assign a separate area to each. Even where populations are, in the main, homogeneous, no group is self-contained, but each is dependent for the necessaries of life on many others; and the supplying of these needs will inevitably open the door to antagonisms and self-aggrandizement.

Essential though liberty, and liberty on the widest scale, is to the solution of the problem, yet to bring about true reconciliation in every sphere something is needed far more thoroughgoing than the idea of liberty. A force is needed capable of transforming the primary instincts and prejudices of human nature—an impulse to brotherhood that will be strong enough to persuade each man of every race to grant, even at great personal sacrifice, to every

individual of every other race, however poor, servile, and degraded, the full rights of complete manhood. In other words, we need a force strong enough to effect a radical spiritual revolution in each individual who is brought into first-hand contact with the race problem in any of its manifold aspects. Each man's soul must be so thoroughly purged from prejudice, self-interest, pride, and hatred that these evil passions may be replaced by a holy passion (for nothing less than a holy passion will suffice) for helping the members of weaker races to the attainment of full freedom and the realization of perfect manhood. The meaning of this is that nothing less than a spiritual force of universal and supreme efficacy can solve the human problem now facing the world. For nothing less than the Christian religion is competent to effect the needful revolution in the fundamental characteristics of human nature.

PART II

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON HUMAN RELATIONS

PART II

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ON HUMAN RELATIONS

I. Jewish Exclusiveness

Jesus Christ belonged to a race which was profoundly self-conscious, profoundly exclusive, and profoundly proud of its aloofness from all other races. He belonged also to a race which groaned in chronic exasperation under its subjection to a great military empire.

From the earliest beginnings of its history the Jewish people had been vividly impressed with their separateness from all their neighbors. They had learned to regard themselves as a "peculiar people," dwelling as strangers among the heathen tribes by which they were surrounded. The basis of this Jewish sense of separateness was essentially religious.

For the Jews believed that God himself had created them as a people, had chosen them for himself, had preserved them from destruction at the hands of the Egyptian oppressors, and in fulfillment of his divine good pleasure had ordained that they should be separate from all other peoples, in order that he might make

them recipients of his exclusive favor and the repository of his unique revelation to mankind.

At first Jehovah, the God thus conceived of as Creator and Patron of the Jewish people, was regarded as a local tribal deity, in no very fundamental respect different from the tribal deities of the surrounding peoples. But as time went on the Jewish idea of their God expanded and developed, until a long succession of great prophets imprinted indelibly upon the mind of the nation two great ideas: first, that God—their own national God—was the God of the whole world; and secondly, that he was a righteous God, demanding purity of motive in his worshipers and punishing them for their national sins by a long series of national disasters.

These great ideas had their origin in the ancient conception of the Covenant made by God with the ancestors of the Jewish nation. At a terrible crisis in their history, a time when after centuries of slavery the Jews were reawakening into liberty, God had sent them a supreme leader, Moses; had saved them from bondage under his leadership and had made with them through him the great Covenant that, if they would love and obey him, they should be his own people, whom he would cherish and train with the love and justice of a father.

"Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people; for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation."[1]

The Covenant thus originated had been renewed from time to time at critical points in the race's history. It had been often broken, and the prophets had frequently had bitter occasion to bring the people back to their allegiance to the divine leadership. But the conviction of their especial relation to God, and of the essentially ethical basis and nature of that relation, had been burnt ineradicably in upon the national mind.

The result upon the Jewish mentality of this deep conviction of God's peculiar interest and care had not been by any means uniformly good; indeed, from many points of view it had been disastrously bad. Together with the ethical idea of the Covenant and the conception of God as a just and loving Father, there grew up a fierce and intolerant national pride, founded in the belief that to the Jews alone of all the peoples of the earth had God revealed himself. During a period of many cen-

[1] Exodus 19: 5, 6; compare Genesis 12: 1-3; 17: 1-4; Joshua 24: 19-25; Jeremiah 7: 38; 17: 24-27; Hosea 4: 1, 2.

turies this pride had been fostered and increased, largely by the misdirected efforts of a hereditary priesthood, which—like other officialized priesthoods—had become the protagonists of reaction, exclusiveness, and narrow patriotism. Moreover, national calamities, as has happened in so many other cases, led but to fresh outbursts of a false nationalism, in which there bulked ever larger and larger an unreasoning arrogance based on the conviction that the Jews were God's own chosen people.

The brief but glorious episode of the national resurrection under the Maccabees (in the second century before Christ) focused the national hopes in a narrowly political aspiration after complete independence. Meanwhile the ethical teaching of the Covenant, which had been magnificently carried forward by the great prophets, dropped into neglect and was replaced by a meticulous system of minute ceremonial observances, manipulated by the priests and by the other influential and respectable classes.

Finally the complete subjection of the Jewish people to the Roman world-empire drove the fires of nationalism underground, there to forge an ever more and more inflexible pride of race —a pride that made the Jew odious wherever

he went. For the Jew's attitude toward men of alien race and faith was one of impartial and scathing contempt. That contempt was founded on a firm belief that his own moral standards were infintely higher than those of any other race.

"These people that know not the law are accursed"—in this typical Jewish sentiment was bound up all the bitter hatred that springs from the deepest of all sources of racial antagonism—the conviction of a fundamental divergence in ethical standards and ideals.

The caste-feeling of the orthodox Jew toward the "gentile" (*i. e.,* the member of any alien race), and particularly toward the aliens and half-breeds (*e. g.,* the Samaritans) with whom he came into closest contact in his own country, was probably as intolerant and exclusive as any caste feeling that has ever existed in the world.

But these evil features in the national mentality had not been suffered to flourish unchallenged. There had been a constant series of great though neglected and persecuted prophets and teachers, who had fearlessly protested against the poisonous pride of their countrymen and the false ideas of God into which this pride led them.

II. The Book of Jonah

It will be well at this point to consider in some detail the teaching of one of these great apostles of truth—a man of whose very name we are ignorant, but who wrote, in the book of Jonah, a merciless condemnation of racial intolerance in a pamphlet which is of the highest relevance to our modern problem of reconciliation.[2]

The book is of course regarded by some as a strictly historical narrative, but whether it be historical or allegorical, its spiritual message is the same.

In this masterpiece of biting irony and pungent criticism, Jonah is portrayed as a Jewish prophet who is commanded by Jehovah to go to the great city of Nineveh, at that time the capital of the known world, and to pronounce against it the doom of God's wrath. Its wickednesses and oppressions have so cried aloud for punishment that in forty days the whole city shall be utterly destroyed.

The prophet does not wish to obey God's command, partly because he is afraid of the consequences to himself of the delivery of such

[2] Use has been made in this connection of an article which appeared in the *New Statesman* of January 17, 1920. One or two sentences in the following section are borrowed directly from this article.

an unpopular message and partly because, as we afterwards discover, he hates Nineveh and its people so bitterly that he is unwilling that they should have any opportunity of repentance or any warning of their approaching fate.

Accordingly he hastily takes ship for Spain, where—as Jonah, but not the writer of the book of Jonah, fondly imagines—the writ of Jehovah does not run.

On the voyage a terrible storm rises, and the ship is likely to be wrecked. Jonah, who is selfish as well as cowardly and disobedient, is meanwhile asleep below. While he is thus indifferent alike to the danger of his companions and to his own duty of making his peace with God, the foreign sailors, who would naturally be regarded by the contemporaries of the author of the book of Jonah as accursed pagans beyond the law, are piously praying each man to his god.

Seeing his passenger's callous disregard both of the common danger and of religion, the captain comes to him and wakens him, saying: "What meanest thou, O sleeper? Arise, call upon thy God, if so be that God will think upon us, that we perish not."

Meanwhile the sailors have decided among themselves that there is a "Jonah" among them, some one whose guilt has brought the

storm upon their ship. Probably they are anything but surprised when the lots are cast and the Jewish passenger, who has already shown himself so irreligious, is found to be the cause of their trouble.

They do not, however, throw him overboard out of hand. Instead they politely request him to disclose to them his guilty secret. This he proceeds to do, with a candor born of despair. His pagan hearers are scandalized at the revelation of such impiety. But they still request him, with perfect courtesy, to indicate his own form of punishment.

Being thus faced with the consequences of his disobedience, and perceiving that he has brought disaster upon himself as well as upon his innocent companions, Jonah appears in a better light than before or after and boldly declares that they ought to throw him overboard. This, however, the courteous foreigners cannot bring themselves to do. They try their hardest to get the ship safe back to land; and only after long and arduous efforts have proved unavailing do they reluctantly consent to apply its rightful punishment to their passenger's guilt.

Even then the grim sacrifice is not performed without grave doubts and the most earnest

prayers to God, on the part of these pagan sailors, for guidance and forgiveness.

Finally the recalcitrant prophet is bundled overboard; and "a good riddance of bad rubbish," as schoolboys say.

The purpose of the book of Jonah must already be clear.

The Jews were rightly regarded by the peoples of antiquity, especially by the Romans, with their broad-minded international and imperial outlook, as quite impossibly bigoted, exclusive, and misanthropic. They were "the enemies of all mankind."

One reason for this misanthropy and exclusiveness was, as we have already seen, the false interpretation which the Jews were in the habit of placing upon the relationships existing between themselves and Jehovah. They regarded the ancient Covenant, which God had made with the forefathers of their nation, as appropriating to themselves for all time, and out of all regard to their individual or national worthiness, an absolute monopoly of God's grace and favor. Consequently they hated and despised the people of every other nation, however much nobler and worthier than themselves those people might be.

This vicious attitude toward other nations inevitably reacted upon the Jewish idea of God

himself. For the mass of the nation he remained the tribal deity who had first made with them the Covenant of Sinai. He was a jealous God, a God not of love, but of tribal exclusiveness, of bloody vengeance against the alien, of dreadful wrath against the transgressor of the iron-bound ceremonial law which had been initiated at the same time as the original Covenant of Sinai.

It is true that throughout Jewish history there was a steadily recurring spiritual revolt against this attitude of exclusiveness and this pretension of a monopoly in the divine grace. The voice of the great prophets, as has already been said, was perpetually raised in protest against these evil things. That voice rings so loud in the portions of the Old Testament which are now more generally read that it is sometimes almost forgotten how prevalent and dangerous were those baneful tendencies against which the prophets so magnificently protested. But to the unknown author of the book of Jonah these things were real and living problems. Like his great forerunners, he knew that his task was to uphold the standard of a universal God, who loved all nations impartially and whose heart of love had nothing but abhorrence for the spirit of pride and exclusiveness—that spirit which found later its

perfect expression to all time in the malevolence that led to the crucifixion of Christ.

Thus the book of Jonah is a powerful and searching story written in the cause of internationalism, in the cause of social reconciliation, in the cause of a universal God, and—if we will—in support of that spirit of world-wide sympathy which forms the only stable basis for any League of Nations.

Jonah, of course, is the Jewish people, ostensibly pious, in reality incorrigibly irreligious, pretending to reverence God while it disobeyed him, infinitely surpassed in ordinary courtesy and kindness and in the essentials of true religion by those gentile nations which it despised and hated. When it comes to a crisis the gentiles pray and the Jew sleeps; and it is clear that the genuine religion of the courteous and devout pagan sailors is acceptable to God, while the sham religion of the hypocritical Jew is abominable to him.

To proceed with the allegory. God is merciful even to so contemptible a creature as Jonah. The whale intervenes between him and death. This incident, on which so much cheap levity has been expended, of course typifies the captivity of the Jewish people in Babylonia, that captivity which, in the estimate of the greatest prophets, among whom, by the way, must

surely be reckoned the author of the book of Jonah, was designed by God both to punish the Jews, to save them, and to reform them. In the words of Jeremiah, speaking for the whole of his people, "Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured me, he hath crushed me, he hath made me an empty vessel, he hath swallowed me up like a dragon, he hath filled his belly with my delicates, he hath cast me out."[3]

In the sequel it is seen that neither false prophet nor bigoted nation were very much better for the discipline of storm and whale's belly, of deportation and captivity. It is true that Jonah employs his enforced leisure in singing a very beautiful lyrical psalm. In it he dwells upon his affliction, and his resolve to reform if rescued, just as the Jewish people during the period of the captivity showed similar signs of a chastened spirit. It is true, also, that after his sudden reappearance the prophet proceeds to Nineveh and there takes an unctuous delight in delivering his message of God's wrath and the coming vengeance. But his frame of mind was as proud and bitter as ever. The message of destruction was a congenial one. He delighted, no doubt, in add-

[3] Jeremiah 51: 34.

ing circumstantial details describing the exact nature of the coming horrors.

However, greatly to his disappointment and chagrin, the people of Nineveh listened to him and took his words to heart. They actually repented in sackcloth and ashes. They abandoned their wickedness. They humbled themselves before God. They, the despised and hated pagan sinners, actually endeavored to make themselves pleasing to the God of Israel. It does not demand very much imagination to enable a modern reader to comprehend the cruel disappointment that all this must have meant to the simple and fanatical soul of Jonah. But worse—much worse is to follow. Jehovah actually hears the prayers of the penitents, relents from his wrath, foregoes his vengeance, and pardons them. The outraged trust of the prophet is scathingly described: "But it displeased Jonah exceedingly, and he was very angry. And he prayed unto the Lord, and said, I pray thee, O Lord, was not this my saying, when I was yet in my country? Therefore I fled before unto Tarshish: for I knew that thou art a gracious God, and merciful [this is a peculiarly effective touch], slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repentest thee of the evil. Therefore now, take, I beseech thee, my

life from me: for it is better for me to die than to live."

It may be doubted whether, in all the sarcasm stored in all the literatures of the world, there is to be found anywhere anything more bitter and mordant than those two verses. The huge city has been preserved from destruction. Even Jonah can see that God has done worthily of himself in so preserving it. But the pious Jew, like a spoiled child, first dares to be impudent to Jehovah himself and then requests sulkily that he may die. "I knew that thou art a gracious God and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness"; these are a string of formal, pious platitudes familiar to any Jew. "I knew that thou repentest thee of the evil which thou hadst intended"; this is blasphemous impertinence; Jonah in his annoyance is presuming to taunt God with fickleness of moral resolve. "Take, I beseech thee, my life from me; for it is better for me to die than to live"; this is the quintessence of childish pique. Jonah regards God's mercy to the penitent sinners as a deep personal insult to himself.

But the verses bear an even more sinister significance. They are a mean and lying subterfuge. Jonah says, in effect, that he had known from the first what would happen and

that was why he had originally run away to sea. In other words, he blames God for his own sin. He says that God was responsible for his own cowardice and disobedience, because he had known all along that God would go back on his word, and this knowledge of God's fickleness had made him run away to Spain, where he thought he would be out of God's reach.

It is a finely drawn picture of what forms (at least in Christ's estimate) the worst conceivable depravity of character. It is a masterpiece sketched in twoscore biting words, with all the strong reserve of a great literary artist. When we turn from the allegory, *i. e.,* from the sketch of Jonah's individual character, to its application, we shall recognize the true greatness of the author of this neglected masterpiece.

For Jonah's unpleasant peculiarities sum up those hideous national faults which led even Christ himself to break, in his fierce denunciation of the Pharisees, his otherwise consistent rule of seeing only the best in every man. Jonah is an epitome of the pride, the hatred of foreigners, the self-sufficiency, which led finally to the fitting horrors of the sack of Jerusalem, but which on the way thereto brought Christ himself to the Cross.

In the first place Jonah knew no more about the God whose prophet he prided himself on being than to suppose that God's writ did not run in Spain. This point justly typifies the chronic Jewish sectarianism, which persisted till the last in regarding God as a tribal deity, exclusively concerned with watching over his own peculiar people.

In the second place, while reluctantly acknowledging that God has acted worthily of himself in saving Nineveh, Jonah wholly fails to comprehend the true meaning of that act of mercy. Christ defines the national failing, which this dullness of spiritual comprehension typifies, in the scathing condemnation whose gist is found in the words, "This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."

In the third place, Jonah presumes to arraign God's justice because it does not agree, on the one hand, with his own petty vindictiveness, and, on the other, with his personal reputation as a veracious prophet of the future. This was typical of the blind self-conceit of the Jews, who, regarding themselves as God's one chosen people, easily came to blame God if things did not go with them as smoothly as they desired. The whole attitude portrays the narrow nationalism, the false patriotism, which claims

God as one of the assets (generally a distinctly secondary one) of the national cause. The spirit of Jonah in this aspect is still very much alive in the world. But the intolerable and blasphemous conceit implied in such an attitude has never been more remorselessly pilloried than in the book of Jonah.

In the fourth place, the contrast must be noticed, which the author of that book so skillfully draws, between the benighted heathen and the enlightened heir of all the oracles of the grace of God. Instead of repenting of his sin, Jonah contrives ingeniously to put the blame for it upon God. The heathen in his blindness, on the other hand, no sooner hears the message of Jehovah's wrath than he proceeds, with a refreshing thoroughness, to show exceedingly practical proofs of repentance. "For word came unto the king of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne, and he laid his robe from him, and covered him with sackcloth, and sat in ashes. And he caused it to be proclaimed and published through Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles, saying, Let neither man nor beast, herd nor flock, taste anything: let them not feed, nor drink water: but let man and beast be covered with sackcloth, and cry mightily unto God: yea, let them turn

every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in their hands."

In this respect Christ's matchless story of the Good Samaritan is in direct spiritual descent from the allegory of Jonah. In both cases the despised heathen outcast is portrayed as sharing the spirit and doing the actions of genuine religion, while the pious Jew is in spirit and action utterly a stranger to the kingdom of God and his righteousness.

But the author of the book of Jonah has not yet finished with his amiable prophet.

Jehovah bears patiently with him. He remains unpunished for his intolerance, his conceit, his blasphemy. The universal God replies to his feeble servant's reproaches with this only, "Doest thou well to be angry?" There is perhaps no higher pinnacle reached in the Old Testament revelation of God than that attained by the writer of the book of Jonah, when he depicts Jehovah as bearing thus patiently with his odious representative.

Patience and kindness are, however, lost on the prophet. He develops an optimistic vein. Perhaps God is only testing his faith and will, after all, be as good as his word and wipe Nineveh from the face of the earth. Glorious thought! Such a magnificent end to all his worries is at any rate worth waiting for! So he

builds himself a shelter outside the city and sits down to wait for the event.

It is a picture for all time of the bloody-minded ferocity to which racial or national exclusiveness can bring a man or a people; and it is a lesson which is perhaps not less needed in the present time than it was in the time of the writing of the book of Jonah.

The rest is soon told. Jehovah sends the gourd to comfort Jonah, who is finding his shelter insufficient to protect him from the sun of Mesopotamia. Jonah appreciates the gourd and is correspondingly aggrieved when Jehovah destroys it again. "And God said to Jonah, Doest thou well to be angry for the gourd? And he said, I do well to be angry, even unto death." Here we have fresh and even more agreeable sidelights upon the prophet's type of mind. "And Jehovah said, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not labored, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night, and perished in a night; and should not I have pity on Nineveh, that great city, wherein there are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?"

The pagan population of Nineveh were as dear to the Jewish God, and, moreover, as need-

ful to his heart of love, as was the shade of the gourd to the false prophet, parched and shriveled in the pitiless glare of the noonday sun.

God yearns to save and to spare a sinful nation, even though its sins merit its instant and wholesale destruction.

No further exposition is needed in order to demonstrate how startlingly modern, how markedly fitted to the conditions of the present day, are the principles so skillfully and graphically laid down, with such biting humor and uncompromising courage, by the man who wrote the book of Jonah long before Christ came to publish to the world the good news of the Love of God.

That writer has left to all time a vivid picture of the dark folly and the fatal wickedness of interracial pride and vindictiveness. He has also set forth clearly the truth that such pride and such vindictiveness can only be conquered through the spirit of the loving and universal God of all nations.

In our search for the bitterly needed solution of the world's international and interracial problems, we shall find the ultimate answer to our quest clearly indicated in this brief pamphlet, which is among the smallest, and also surely among the greatest, of the books of the Old Testament.

For in an entire obedience to, and in an enthusiastic love for God, the Father of all mankind, is the only hope for the brotherhood of humanity and for the future reconciliation of all the nations and races of the earth.

III. The Example of Christ

We must now consider the attitude adopted by Christ toward the various conflicting racial elements in his own environment. We shall thus gain a clear conception of the manner in which he actually worked out in daily practice the concrete application of his principles. We shall subsequently discuss those principles themselves. The reason for choosing such an inductive method of inquiry lies in the fact that in regard to conduct toward members of other races the minds of men are perhaps more subject to the influence of hypocrisy and self-deception than in regard to any other sphere of behavior. Of a thousand men who express enlightened opinions and lay down liberal principles and theories regarding the treatment of subject races, there are perhaps ten who in actual practice carry out those principles when faced with the need for dealing courteously and sympathetically over a long period of time with members of another race. In no other connection is it so difficult to "practice what you

preach." We shall, therefore, first consider how Christ acted toward individual members of alien races in his own environment and shall leave till later our consideration of the principles which lay behind his action.

(1) In Regard to the Jewish Nationalists

Christ had close affinities with the Zealots—the party of fanatical nationalism among the Jews. He was a Galilean peasant, and Galilee had always been the stronghold of the Zealots. He was the cousin of Simon the Zealot.[4] He welcomed this same Simon the Zealot into the inner circle of his friendship (Luke 6: 5). From infancy, as a peasant of Galilee, he must have been steeped in the fierce anti-foreign traditions and sentiments of the Zealot party. He was steeped also in the ancient literature of his country, especially in those prophetic and apocalyptic portions of it which emphasize so graphically the hope of the coming Messiah.

Again and again during the public life of Christ, the nationalist elements among the common people, and even his most intimate and discerning friends, desired to force upon him the role of a political Messiah.[5]

[4] Edersheim, "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah," II, 603.

[5] See John 6: 15; and compare Matthew 11: 3; Mark 10: 35; Luke 19: 38; 24: 21, etc.

His popularity for a time was such that he could undoubtedly have headed a widespread revolt against Rome. With his ideals of the kingdom of God, and his vivid consciousness of divine support, the temptation to yield to this popular pressure must have been very definite and real. Had he become the Messiah in the popular sense, he might have used the supernatural assistance of which he was so intensely aware (Matt. 26: 53) to establish a government—not only in Palestine, but over the whole earth—in which peace, justice, and righteousness should have had full play. In the account of the Devil tempting Christ to worship him, and promising that as a reward for such worship he would give him all the kingdoms of the world, we clearly have a reference to this inducement to establish a rule of righteousness by political and military means. It is a picture of the temptation which must, in fact, have again and again powerfully attracted Christ toward political Messiahhood and the establishment of a world-wide kingdom of God by force of victorious arms.

The popular pressure in this direction was so strong that Christ had to retire into solitude to avoid it. When the people found him again he was compelled to damp their enthusiasm by scathing sarcasm (John 6: 26), directed against

the mercenary motives which had made them so fond of him and so desirious of exalting him into their king. Then and at other times he could only escape from their importunity by a relentless and (as it must have seemed) wearisome insistence upon the exclusively spiritual nature both of his message and of the benefits which acceptance of that message would confer upon his hearers. He was even driven to shock the susceptibilities of his fickle-minded admirers by promulgating a paradox, which so offended their taste that many of them deserted him forthwith (John 6: 66). It is probable also that his retirement from Palestine to Syria, where he remained in hiding for a time (Mark 7: 24), was due to his popularity and to the fear that he would forcibly be put at the head of an armed insurrection aginst Rome.

That this was not a merely imaginary danger is shown by the fact that, when he was finally arraigned before the Roman governor, the hypocritical malice of his fellow countrymen (disappointed as they had been in the hope which they had once entertained that he would take up the role of a political deliverer of his country) prompted them to make this the main charge aginst him—that he had endeavored to make himself such a Messiah (John 19: 12; Luke 23: 2) and had thus attempted to destroy

the Roman government. The fact that this charge of sedition could be made at all shows clearly the strength of the popular pressure which must from time to time have been put on Christ in order to induce him to accept the role of national deliverer. There must at one time have been a common expectation that he would, in fact, accept that role; and the fact that he had repeatedly refused to do so could easily be ignored, or deliberately concealed, in the manufacture of the charge against him. The governor was clearly not himself deceived by this malicious trickery (John 18: 38). On the contrary, in his order to label the crucified prisoner "The King of the Jews," he was indulging in a grim vein of humor (John 19: 21) against those false accusers of the innocent, regarding whose real disaffection to his government he was no more in the dark than he was in regard to their malice and hypocrisy. In reality Christ suffered because he had not committed the very crime which his countrymen, who brought about his conviction for that crime, had again and again urged him to commit. They had him killed ostensibly because he had made himself out to be a political Messiah, in reality because he had not done so.

Thus it is clear that, though Christ was born and bred in the midst of an atmosphere of

wild nationalism and fanatical race hatred, yet he entirely refused to share in that nationalism or to countenance that race hatred. He chose this intensely unpopular path, in face of the traditions on which he had been reared, in face of the pressure of friends and fellow countrymen, in face of the grievous wrongs which his country had suffered and was still suffering from Rome. He deliberately, and at the cost of his popularity, and ultimately of his life also, rejected the temptation to fulfill the glorious hopes of his people, to deliver his suffering country, and to establish a world-wide dominance of the laws of God. This choice led, by inevitable steps, to his rejection at the hands of his fellow countrymen of all classes, and finally to the shameful death of one who seemed to have played the coward and traitor to the cause of his country. Christ chose this craven and contemptible course of action (as it seemed to his contemporaries) rather than one which would have led to the delivery of an oppressed people, to the rule of righteousness, to popularity and to success, but through racial conflict.

For the crucially important significance of the Cross of Christ in the enterprise of racial reconciliation is this, that the way of the Cross, the way of the kingdom of God, was the way of reconciliation chosen in preference to the far

more attractive way of antagonism and conflict. Christ might, by espousing the cause of the Jewish race against the Romans, have freed that race from cruel bondage, and through it have brought the blessings of his own good government to the whole world. He preferred, rather than do so, to suffer a cruel death himself and to allow his race and nation to perish. But the result of his so doing was the Cross, which, in face of racial and national conflicts, means the gospel of reconciliation, whereby the world shall be saved and the problem of racial antagonism solved.

(2) In Regard to the Roman Government

Christ's attitude to Rome, and to her officers and agents, shows the same entire refusal to countenance current racial antagonisms as does his attitude, which we have just considered, to the nationalist movement in his country.

The Jews were accustomed to occasional acts of barbaric cruelty on the part of their Roman masters—atrocities committed in order to keep the unruly elements of the populace in a state of wholesome awe.

In view of Christ's manifest capacities for leadership, and of his antecedents as a Galilean peasant closely connected with the Zealots, bitter complaints concerning such

atrocities were brought to him. The hope clearly was that indignation at Roman "frightfulness" would at last persuade him to commit himself to the leadership of the longed-for insurrection, or at least would force him to utter a compromising condemnation of the perpetrators of such crimes. His contemporaries knew well what a fire of scorn he could bring against the elements of corruption among his fellow countrymen. Could he not at least be persuaded to employ the same fierce eloquence against the alien oppressor?

Christ sorely disappointed these patriotic hopes.

Instead of doing what was expected of him, instead even of acquiescing in the indignation of his interlocutors, he dragged in (as it must have seemed) the side-issue of religion and then turned the incident of "frightfulness" in question into a grim lesson, or rather into a definite threat, against those who had reported it. "I tell you, Nay; but, unless ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish" (Luke 13: 3).

No wonder that Christ lost his popularity with the wild fanatics who formed the vast majority of his fellow countrymen. He sealed his own fate when he thus scornfully refused to feed their lust for racial animosity.

We notice the same refusal to take up an at-

titude of racial antagonism in Christ's treatment of the hated Roman taxgatherers.

These taxgatherers were loathed by the Jews as traitors and renegades—men who for base personal gain used the authority accorded them by the foreign government or its subject princes in order to oppress the poor and to extort from them all that could be obtained by cruelty and corruption.

By the respectable and religious elements in the Jewish population these tax collectors were classed together with social outcasts, prostitutes, and criminals, as entirely beyond the pale of intercourse. Jewish patriots of every type felt that if there was one black blot that must at all costs be expunged from the national life before God could give them the national revival that they craved, it was the base treachery, and indeed the very existence, of these odious tax farmers. On them was concentrated the bitterest ferocity of the Jewish racial hatred. For though they were born Jews, these men had so far forgotten their birthright and their racial honor as to become the abandoned tools of a cruel alien tyranny, used for the oppression of their fellow countrymen.

The renegade is always better hated than

the alien, the traitor than the oppressor, the toady than the bully.

Yet, execrable as such men were, Christ deliberately associated with them. He stayed in their houses, made friends with them, even joined with them and with their disreputable associates in what all decent people regarded as their unhallowed and disgraceful revels.[6]

This attitude toward the tax collectors, no less than his refusal to take the lead in a national uprising, definitely estranged Christ from the mass of his fellow countrymen. There is, perhaps, in all history no more striking instance of a reformer rising superior to all considerations of prejudice, of public opinion, of expediency, and of popularity.

We have record of one occasion on which a definite attempt was made to get Christ to commit himself to an anti-Roman propaganda. Some members of the respectable patriotic party of the Pharisees, who hated Christ for his uncompromising condemnations of their shortcomings, and also for his refusal to lead a movement of national revival and revolt,[7]

[6] Matthew 9: 10, 11; 11: 19; 21: 31-33; Luke 15: 1, 2; 19: 1-6; etc.

[7] The Pharisees were constantly watching for a "sign" to show that the moment for revolt, and the needed Leader (Messiah), had arrived. Many of them probably half believed that Christ's miraculous powers constituted this sign.

made an unnatural combination against him with the Herodians. These latter were supporters of the semi-native dynasties, which, under the Romans, and supported by them, ruled a great part of the country. They hated the Reformer for a reason opposite to that for which the Pharisees hated him—they were afraid that he might become the leader of an insurrection which would overthrow the power and position of their masters.

These ill-assorted allies approached Christ in an attempt to make him declare himself, once and for all, either for or against Rome. They asked him whether or no he approved of paying the Roman taxes. The dilemma in which he was thus placed was very ingeniously devised. The Herodians hoped that he would declare for Rome, on whose support their patrons depended. The Pharisees possibly still hoped that he would declare for revolt. They already knew to their cost, from the severity of his condemnations of themselves and from the eagerness with which the common people had listened to those condemnations, that he had in him enough, and more than enough, of the moral courage and the capacity for leadership which were demanded in the Messiah. Moreover, even their hard hearts had been impressed by the clear signs of divine

inspiration and favor shown by his work and spirit. At any rate, both parties anticipated that, whatever answer Christ gave to their ingeniously propounded question, the present position would be radically altered. Either he would be compelled to become the Messiah, in which case he might either succeed or fail; or he would be compelled to sacrifice his popularity with the people. At any rate, matters would be brought to a head. On the one hand, the Roman government would not brook open sedition; and, on the other hand, the people would not brook an unpatriotic pronouncement in favor of paying the unpopular taxes.

It needs little imagination to picture that scene—the proud Pharisees with their broad-fringed robes, the smooth Herodians in semi-Roman attire, the fierce northern Zealots hemming in the little group, many of them probably carrying concealed arms, and needing only a word from the Galilean miracle-worker to send them storming in wild insurrection up the approaches of the frowning Tower of Antonia, where the Roman garrison had its stronghold.

In the issue Christ declared uncompromisingly and without the slightest hesitation for Rome. Taking a Roman coin, he uttered the fatal words, "Render unto the Emperor the

things that are the Emperor's, and unto God the things that are God's." The die was cast once and for all. The decision had been made in the most public circumstances; for the Pharisees and Herodians had chosen their opportunity well. The incident in all probability marks the final turning-point of Christ's popularity. Thenceforth he was hopelessly discredited with the patriotic Jews. He had deliberately pronounced for the foreign oppressor. He had proved himself a traitor to his own race, to his own upbringing, to his own destiny—or so it seemed to his fellow countrymen.

Nothing shows more clearly than this moving and dramatic incident the fact of Christ's refusal, at all costs, to have anything to do with racial antagonism in any shape or form. In face of his country's bitter and shameful sufferings, in face of the zealous patriotism of his relations and friends, he had once and for all refused to sanction interracial conflict, even when that conflict was to be undertaken in defense of the weak and oppressed and—ostensibly at any rate—merely in the modified form of a passive resistance to unjust and tyrannous taxation.

Clearly Christ realized the necessity of racial reconciliation in an extraordinarily vivid manner and was willing to pay a very high price

indeed in order that he might personally further the cause of that reconciliation.

It is, moreover, worthy of note that Christ did not hesitate to condemn his fellow countrymen in very plain language for their inordinate racial conceit. On the occasion when the Roman captain came to ask him for help with his sick servant (Matt. 8: 5ff.), Christ—disregarding the hatred in which Romans as Romans were held—used the incident to drive home the much-needed lesson that the Jews were likely to be found fatally lacking in just those qualities of soul and character which are essential for the membership of God's kingdom; whereas many who belonged to the despised gentile races would be found truly fitted for that kingdom.

To Jews, trained to regard themselves with unreasoning confidence as God's chosen people and to contemn all Gentiles as lying beyond the and to contemn all gentiles as lying beyond the cursed, this saying of Christ's must have constituted the bitterest of insults. It was an uncalled-for attack upon the very bases of morality and religion. For in those days, as so often in our own days also, moral and religious sanctions were regarded in the popular view as consecrating the permanent estrangement of races.

If this saying (*i. e.,* Matt. 8: 11, 12) stood alone, it would form a sovereign proof of the fact that Jesus Christ, a Galilean peasant, member of the most bigoted portion of the most bigoted population that the world has ever seen, rose in a manner nothing short of supernatural above his environment and the traditions of his people and enunciated the principles of a spiritual cosmopolitanism, which, coming from Galilee, can be regarded only as miraculous.

(3) In Regard to the Samaritans

Nor is Christ's superiority to all racial feeling less clearly shown in his attitude toward the despised and ostracized Samaritans.

No decent Jew would have anything to do with these semi-pagan usurpers and half-breeds. Yet Christ deliberately broke down such barriers. He ate and drank with Samaritans and stayed in their houses (John 4). He even invited rebuffs by his trustful good fellowship and brought on himself a boorish refusal of hospitality from those with whom he would thus have associated. So he became an outcast of the outcasts (Luke 9: 51-56).

To call a man a Samaritan was a deadly insult, comparable to calling him devil-possessed (John 8: 48). Yet in the parable of the Good

Samaritan Christ, again almost wantonly outraging racial susceptibilities, deliberately chose a Samaritan as his type of the man who truly loved God and his neighbor; and in the same great parable he scathingly showed forth the hollowness of the piety on which the orthodox Jew prized himself so inordinately.

Here, again, the manner in which Christ rose above the racial prejudices and hatreds of his time is nothing less than miraculous.

(4) Christ's Cosmopolitanism

We may notice also more general signs of Christ's cosmopolitanism. In condemning the wicked cities of his own countryside (Luke 10: 13, 14) he does not hesitate to declare that the heathen cities of Syria, which were generally regarded by the Jews as hotbeds of license and vice, were in reality far more pleasing to God than the cities of those who condemned them. In itself this was a startlingly bold conception for a Jew of that age.

More than this, with a fierce disregard for the racial susceptibilities of his countrymen, Christ declared that their refusal to accept his message would condemn them to a fate more miserable than that of Sodom and Gomorrah, ancient heathen cities of the aboriginal Canaanites, which had been notorious from the begin-

ning of Jewish history for the heinousness of their sins and for the fearful punishment which was sent upon them for those sins.[8] To compare the cities of his own home province to those ancient seats of filthy wickedness, and, moreover, definitely to the disadvantage of the former, must have seemed to Christ's Jewish hearers the acme of morbid anti-patriotism.

Yet we shall be grievously mistaken if we suppose that Christ was a merely sentimental internationalist, an insipid depreciator—in season and out of season—of his own race and nation. For he was nothing of the kind. He was in the deepest of all possible senses a true patriot. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate!" It is impossible to read such words as these without realizing that Christ loved and yearned for his motherland with the deepest loyalty and devotion, a devotion which gave him exquisite grief in the realization of the terrible gap between the national responsibilities and opportunities and the national character

[8] Matt. 10: 15; 11: 24. *Cf.* Matt. 8: 12; 21: 43.

and achievements. He recognized his country's bitter faults, and, like the prophets who had gone before him, foretold the terrible results of those faults. Yet this only made him desire the more deeply to see a national repentance which by spiritual means should give back to his country its ancient position of religious leadership. He knew that time and again through her history God had spoken his own truth to the world by the mouth of Jewish heroes and prophets. He desired intensely that some far-reaching national reformation should make it possible for God so to speak to the world once more, this time by the mouth of the whole nation, by the concrete and literal establishment of a genuine kingdom of God on earth.

For he knew that so only, by some great spiritual movement, could his race be saved from destruction and fulfill God's ancient purposes for itself, and for all mankind through itself.

Christ loved all men of all races equally. The things he hated were to be found in every land and race. He entertained no sentimental delusions, either as to the true character of his own countrymen or as to that of their enemies and oppressors. His work, to which his whole life was bent, was the elimination of

hatred in every sphere and the establishment of that great system which, following the example of many of his predecessors, he named the kingdom of God.

The cosmopolitanism of Christ was that of a sturdy, independent, self-respecting spirit, which loved its own country dearly, and mourned with genuine grief over her sins and disasters: yet which saw both the good and the evil with equal clearness in the men of other races. His "eye was single." Unblinded either by prejudice or false sentiment, by racial conceit, by hatred, by partisanship or by empty enthusiasm, he saw the need of the world as a whole. He perceived unerringly the necessity that men of all nations should find a new attitude toward God, which would in itself solve all problems of racial and personal interrelationship.

For it cannot be too strongly insisted that Christ's whole attitude to every problem of humanity depended upon his attitude to God.

IV. Christ's Conception of God

(1) His Fatherhood

The sovereign and magnificent conception of God's Fatherhood so dominated and possessed the mind of Christ that he lived only to publish the idea to the world and to establish

the kingdom in which God's love should have perfect freedom to control all the lives and activities of men.

When he was facing, alone and exhausted, the imminent prospect of a horrible and shameful death, his great prayer, recorded for us in the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, contains, repeated over and over again, the cry of "Father," "Father." In his extremity Christ clings with passionate devotion and unfaltering confidence to this last resource—his knowledge of the Fatherhood of God. It was his sheet anchor in the hurricane of disaster, ignominy, and death which had overwhelmed him. It is the only final and secure refuge for humanity amidst the raging furies of racial antagonism. From the dynamic conviction of the Fatherhood of God, and from this alone, the idea of the brotherhood of man can derive the practical cogency which is needed to transform it from an academic doctrine of constitution-mongers to a force in the world strong enough to break down the barriers which divide race from race.

God was to Christ not a distant and inaccessible potentate, graciously admitting to his audience chamber those whose purity made them acceptable to him; but he was Father of mankind. "At that season Jesus answered

and said, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight'' (Matt. 11: 25). ''After this manner therefore pray ye, Our Father, which art in heaven'' (Matt. 6: 9). ''How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?'' (Matt. 7: 11). ''Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you, that you may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven'' (Matt. 5: 44).

Such sayings are scattered through the Gospels, and they reveal a mind saturated with a vivid consciousness of the Fatherhood of God, Fatherhood in which heavenly majesty and divine holiness are indeed essential attributes, but are clearly secondary in importance to the one transcendent attribute of love—love so simple and so fatherly as to be comprehensible to the least sophisticated intelligence.

To Christ's mind God is a Father, not in the sense of a benevolent despot of his family, but of one who feels his children's ills more bitterly than if they were his own, who grieves over their faults as wounding himself, who delights to give them freely all that they need, and who desires above all things that they should be

united in will and in love to himself. "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall to the ground without your Father: but the very hairs of your head are all numbered. Fear not, therefore; ye are of more value than many sparrows." (Matt. 10: 29-31.)

Although he has absolute power of life and death over the soul (Luke 12: 5), yet God is infinitely tender toward the commonest and most insignificant of his creatures.

He watches over mankind with far more than a mother's anxious and practical care. "Be not, therefore, anxious, saying, what shall we eat or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed? For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first his kingdom and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

It is worthy of the most attentive notice that this new interpretation of the nature of God—this bold and startling analogy between the love of the Ruler of the universe for his meanest creatures and the love of a weak and finite earthly parent for his own children—has not only revolutionized the thoughts of men about God, but has also given to them an utterly new conception of the inherent dignity of human

life. From this new conception has directly sprung the modern enthusiasm for the freedom of the individual and for democracy, since these great ideas are based on the religious asseveration that all men are equal in God's sight and are equally dear to him.

Christ's conception of the Fatherhood of God has also done matchless service to mankind in transforming and uplifting men's ideals of human parenthood. Unconsciously the world has come more and more closely to apply Christ's ideal of Fatherhood not only to the Heavenly Father, but to the earthly father as well. Men have realized that the love of God for themselves means, among other inevitable consequences, that human fathers must endeavor to love their children in something of the same way.

Moreover, as human fatherhood has thus become more tender and more discerning, mankind's idea of God's Fatherhood has tended to become higher and better also. Each generation of children—learning, from practical experience of their own fathers' ever-deepening love, a higher and better ideal of fatherhood—have gained thereby a progressively enhanced capacity for appreciating at its true worth the meaning of the Fatherhood of God. For it is a deep law of human nature—as Christ knew

well when he gave his teaching in parables and in the great word of the Fatherhood of God—that we proceed in all spiritual knowledge from the known to the unknown, from the seen to the unseen.

Hence, in a golden spiral sequence, men's ideals of the divine Fatherhood and of human fatherhood have, from the time of Christ onward, each continued to uplift the other. It follows that Christ's enthusiasm for the Fatherhood of God has made men enthusiastic for the cause of human childhood. In the liberation of childhood from the ferocious disciplines of the past, from the hopeless degradations of the old child labor, from mechanical and soulless methods of education, the champions of the children have followed worthily in the steps of Him who brought to earth as a working fact the knowledge of the Fatherhood of God, and who consequently loved the children so well that he took them on his knee, blessed them, and told his hearers that their only hope of pleasing God was to become themselves like little children.

Christ's great word, "the Fatherhood of God," is a magnificently powerful and concrete and tender mode of expression for that supreme truth, enunciated explicitly in our Bible, not by Christ himself, but by his most

spiritually minded disciple, that *God is Love.* It is this truth which lies behind the graphic and concrete expositions of the nature of the Heavenly Father set forth in the parable of the Prodigal Son, in the analogy between the weak and faulty human father giving his child good gifts and the Heavenly Father giving his child the Holy Spirit, and in the great command, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you, that ye may be sons of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5: 44, 45).

It is this nature of love, again, which has prompted God to give, generously and with no hesitation, the most precious of all gifts that he could give, to make the most absolute of all sacrifices—for the redemption of mankind from sin and death (John 3: 16). For in his Gospel John showed in practical operation that fundamental divine attribute of love which—taught by his Master—he had defined long before in his Epistle.

(2) Christ's Idea of God's Holiness

In Christ's mind God is not only Father, but also "Holy Father." The influence of the great Jewish prophets had been effective in bringing

home to the minds of their contemporaries the fact that national redemption depended entirely on obedience to God's eternal laws of righteousness; but in many cases these laws had been rigidly and mechanically conceived of as the hard-and-fast regulations of the ancient Covenant which God had made with the forefathers of the nation. With this trend of thought, as represented by the Pharisees, "scribes," and "lawyers" of his day, Christ waged an unrelenting warfare.[9] His spirit was too great, too freedom-loving, ever to be enslaved to any hidebound legal code. For Christ, morality was the spontaneous and joyful assent of the human will to the divine will. There was no hint of legalism in his conception of righteousness. He knew God too well to degrade him by imputing to him a "justice" which implied the jealous and pettifogging exaction of certain definite moral dues from mankind. Nothing could satisfy that "hunger and thirst after righteousness," which was his ideal of morality, except the identification of God's will with man's will. "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

Some of the great prophets had risen above

[9] See, for instance, Matt. 23, *passim*.

this legalism, which in the Pharisees and their satellites persisted so fatally down to Christ's own day. One or two of them had reached an appreciation of the great truth that the Divine Nature is in itself pure and holy and loving, and that God, therefore, desires fellowship with men who have themselves become pure and holy. Righteousness was with these prophets no longer a law imposed from above, to be slavishly and meticulously followed on pain of suffering and disaster. They had begun genuinely to comprehend that it must be a communion of wills between God and man. "Thus saith the high and holy one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him that is of a contrite and a humble spirit" (Isa. 57: 15; *cf.* Isa. 6: 1-8), "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic. 6: 8.)

Christ inherited from his forerunners this great and spiritual conception of the holiness of God. He inherited also its implications for human morality in the realization that God desires that men should share his own holiness in a spiritual fellowship with himself. Through Christ's life and teachings these conceptions were vastly deepened and broadened and were

merged, indeed, in the full gospel of the love of God. In his hands morality came to mean the unconscious attitude of a happy and responsive child to its father, a father who, as the child knows, loves him for his own sake and seeks to share with him all good and precious gifts. Morality for Christ was the spontaneous imitation of the little boy who in admiration for his father tries to do and to say exactly what "daddy" does and says.

In the great prayer to which reference has already been made (John 17), Christ addresses God as, "O Holy Father" and "O Righteous Father"; for God is to him the origin of all generous goodness, the perfect ideal of all pure and lofty character. To those who came to learn morality from him he gives no lower an ideal than that of becoming exactly like God in this perfection of pure and lofty character (Matt. 5: 48). He prays that God will make his friends holy through the divine truth; that God will share with them his own perfect purity and goodness.

Furthermore, Christ tells us that the new moral law which he lived and died to enunciate, the law of the kingdom of God, the law of perfect self-sacrifice and of the supremacy of love in all human relationships, was derived, not from his own spiritual genius, but directly from

God himself. "The word which ye hear is not mine, but my Father's who sent me."

In truth the whole teaching of Christ, and especially that embodied in such parables as those of the Prodigal Son, the Talents, and the Sheep and the Goats, is saturated with the idea of God's holiness and justice. But these are not merely the transcendent attributes of the Ruler of the Universe. They are qualities which, by their very nature, seek to propagate themselves among men. The Father of the Prodigal Son yearned to receive back the repentant wanderer into the home where purity and love reigned supreme. The Master who distributed the talents demanded that those talents, which came from his own treasury, should be appropriated and used. The Judge of all the earth, who divides the sheep from the goats, does so on the basis of a character of loving service, which sees and loves and serves God himself in the most needy and miserable of mankind. And that character of loving service is the character of God himself.

Hence the purity and righteousness of God are redemptive qualities which seek to win men from impurity and injustice and to breed in them the likeness of the loving and perfect Father.

The enthusiasm of Christ for God is thus

first, and most essentially, love and admiration for a Father, a tender and wise protector, lover, and friend of the human race. Secondly, it is reverence for the fountain of purity and righteousness that are not coldly aloof from the sinful world, but are striving continually to reproduce themselves in that world by making men pure and righteous, holy and perfect, just as God is.

These ideas were, in the case of Christ, couched in language which, in order to make it comprehensible at all to his contemporaries, had to be of elementary simplicity and largely of a figurative and metaphorical nature. But that language is none the less the supreme expression of an inward and vivid experience, of an immediate knowledge of God's nature and truth. God's love was for Christ a reality which had to be expressed somehow or other to the ordinary men among whom he lived. From his boyhood he had known that that love was the greatest of all facts in his own life. He had spent long periods in the deserts and on the mountains in meditation and prayer. As he had done so he had entered deeper and deeper into the knowledge of all that God is and means for the human race. That knowledge had found its necessary outcome in his own life of humble service and unassuming friendship for the poor

and outcast, and in the great principles which he laid down for the salvation of the world from for tyranny of hatred and antagonism.

Thus, under the influence of his enthusiasm for God, that process had in Christ fully taken place which must take place in a vast aggregate of human lives before the work of racial reconciliation can finally be achieved. In Christ the experience of God's Fatherhood, of his love and power and purity, was so vividly present and so dynamically operative, that all barriers became ridiculous and obsolete. In one who believed in and experienced God as Christ did, there could be no racial exclusiveness, no national pride, no barriers of intolerant religious or ethical outlook.

We shall solve the varied problems of racial reconciliation only as we return to Christ's enthusiasm for God's Fatherhood and to the personal experience which he enjoyed of the love of the righteous Father—love which, in his most intimate conviction, was shed abroad equally upon men of every race and nation.

The recovery of Christ's realization of God's Fatherhood, and its practical outcome in lives which shall be themselves powerful engines of reconciliation, is absolutely essential for the solving of our modern interracial problems. It

constitutes indeed the one and only solution of those problems.

V. Christ's Conception of the Kingdom of God

We have now to consider Christ's conception of the kingdom of God in its direct bearing on the relationships of man with man and of race with race.

It is essential, in the first place, to emphasize once more the fact that Christ definitely rejected ordinary methods of political action for the establishment of the kingdom, and that his motive for this rejection was his conviction that the kingdom is neither a political institution, nor a system of government, nor a system of political, social, or metaphysical thought, nor a legal system, such as had been constituted by the Jewish idea of religion, nor even an ethical system, like those embodied in the religions of Buddha and Confucius. The kingdom is an inward and spiritual state of the souls of men, of souls possessed with an enthusiasm for God their Father and for men their brethren. As it prevails over wider and wider areas of humanity, this kingdom will bring about the control of God's will of love in all human relationships. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here! or, Lo there! for, behold, the kingdom of

God is within you" (Luke 17: 20, 21). "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven (*i. e.*, the kingdom of God)" (Matt. 18: 3). "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 7: 21). The Gospels are full of sayings such as these, which show that Christ's idea of the kingdom is that of the reign of God's will over men's wills, an inward and spiritual control independent of all external apparatus of organization or government.

The spiritual power which enabled Christ himself to triumph over the forces of evil was in itself a sign of the actual presence of the kingdom of God as then and there existing on earth among men (Matt. 12: 28).

His hope was fixed upon a gradual and progressive permeation and conformation of the world by the practical ideals of the kingdom, until the common earth as we know it shall be changed into God's heaven.

He held that the kingdom was a practical state of society, which should be actually inaugurated to a considerable extent in the lifetime of his hearers (Mark 9: 1), and the secrets of whose inner workings could be understood even by such simple minds as those of his own

immediate followers (Mark 4: 11). In the Lord's Prayer he taught those followers to pray for the realization of God's kingdom in close connection with the petitions for the fulfillment of the divine will in this world, and for such a practical and commonplace matter as the daily supply of food. "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread"—all these three are practical matters of immediate interest and necessity to every one who is truly devoted to God's service.

There are many other similar passages, notably the parables of the Sower, the Tares, the Mustard Seed, the Leaven, which show that Christ thought of the coming of the kingdom as an intensely practical affair, nothing less indeed than that transformation of character, whether in the individual or in the mass, which results in the bearing of the fruit of spiritual and moral regeneration.

The whole fifth chapter of Matthew, and especially its last verse, shows that the ideal character of the ideal citizen of the kingdom is the character of God himself lived under the ordinary conditions of everyday earthly life.

It follows that from one point of view the kingdom depends on very definitely individualistic factors. It is a process of moral enlight-

enment going on in individual hearts and resulting in the transformation of single personalities into the likeness of God himself. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3: 3).

Great emphasis is laid nowadays, and is rightly laid, on the social implications of the gospel; but this emphasis must not blind us to the fact that Christ himself gave much less definite and frequent teaching about social righteousness than some of the great prophets who had preceded him (see, for example, Isa. 50, Amos 8, Mic. 6). He is chiefly concerned in his moral teaching with the ideal character of the individual citizen of the kingdom.

That citizen is to be humble and of childlike simplicity; for "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." Upon this trait of character Christ's emphasis was most strong. Without such simplicity of heart it will be impossible for a man so to subordinate all his personal desires and selfish ambitions that he may become a truly loyal follower of God, devoting his life to the one great aim of fulfilling God's will.

The citizen, again, must be resolute and pertinacious (Luke 9: 62). He must be devoted

to duty. He must be brave in the face of discouragement, unpopularity, and hardship (Matt. 5: 11, 12; 10: 28; 16: 24-28, etc.). He must be ready to disregard all considerations of worldly advantage. "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom. Sell what you have and give alms; provide for yourselves bags which grow not old, a treasure in the heavens that faileth not." (Luke 12: 32, 33.)

But, after all, these latter are only the essential characteristics of any true patriot. Christ demanded these and infinitely more also. The root of all citizenship in the kingdom of God must be humble self-sacrifice and loving service of others. "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your slave; and whosoever will be the chief among you, let him be your servant"—so Christ replied to his two intimate friends, when they came to ask him for the chief positions of authority in what they supposed to be an earthly kingdom. "If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all and slave of all"—these were his words to the company of his friends when they had been quarreling among themselves as to who should have the fattest and most dignified posts in the coming kingdom.

The root of citizenship in the kingdom of

God is thus love for men and service for men —love and service that may mean (as they meant for Christ himself) shame and suffering and death; for "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

We thus perceive that Christ's teaching dealt rather with the ideal character of the individual citizen of the kingdom than with social morality. "As Harnack says, the gospel is not one of social improvement, but of spiritual redemption. Its influence upon social and political life is indirect and obscure, operating through a subtle modification of current valuations and curbing the competitive and acquisitive instincts, which nearly correspond with what Christ called 'Mammon' and St. Paul the 'flesh.' Christianity is a spiritual dynamic, which has very little to do directly with the mechanism of social life."[10]

Yet the type of character which Christ demanded from the citizen of the kingdom was one which made inevitable the transformation of society into accordance with the will of God and the control of all the relationships of human intercourse by the law of the divine nature of love. Love and service in the individual are of themselves the absolute root and basis of

[10] Inge, "Outspoken Essays," p. 250.

all social regeneration. It is clearly impossible that a group of individuals should remain merely a group of individuals, provided that each of them is reflecting in his human life that divine life which is universal love and proving himself to be the genuine and loyal subject of a heavenly King who is more essentially a Father than a King.

In a significant passage Christ describes the essentially social nature of the kingdom of God by a striking figure. "And they shall come from the east and from the west, from the north and from the south, and shall sit down in the kingdom of God with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Luke 13: 29). In the account given by Matthew this description of the joyful good fellowship of the kingdom is coupled with one of those passages in which Christ breaks most definitely and bitterly with the racial exclusiveness of his own nation. "But the children of the kingdom (the Jews) shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matt. 8: 12). For the more convinced Christ became of the sovereign love and Fatherhood of God, and of the essentially social, joyful, and universal character of God's kingdom, the more keenly did he realize how utterly at variance with these good things was that spirit of racial pride

and of arrogant antagonism toward men of alien race and heredity which so clearly marked his own countrymen.

VI. "Enthusiasm of Humanity," The Law of the Kingdom

Christ did not merely love men for what they might become as citizens of the kingdom, or because they were the children of the heavenly Father. He loved them for their own sakes. He made friends with them, especially with the vicious and disreputable among them. He worked unremittingly to help and to save them—not only to save their souls from sin, but to save their bodies from disease, misery, and hunger.

One of the great tasks which he set before himself was that of so communicating this "enthusiasm of humanity" to his followers that in their hearts also should be opened a never-failing fountain of love and good will toward their fellow men. "All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets" (Matt. 7: 12). "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two command-

ments hang all the law and the prophets." (Matt. 22:37-40.)

In such great passages Christ expresses the essence of the law of the kingdom of God. It is a society in which loyalty to God is so strong that his will of love is reproduced in the attitude of the citizens toward each other. The solidarity of God's human family is such a real fact that sin or suffering in one member must immediately call forth from other members that same impulse to save which God feels toward mankind, that loving service which a man would wish other men to show toward himself if he were in similar circumstances. Oppression, cruelty, or injustice done to another, however degraded or despised, must be felt as deeply as if it had been done to one's self.

In the great parables of the Lost Sheep and the Lost Son Christ set vividly before his hearers the fact that the most willful, degenerate, and sinful of mankind is of infinite worth to God himself. Such teaching was in itself a doctrine of revolutionary novelty. Even the very greatest of Christ's forerunners among the Jewish prophets had not advanced beyond the thought that God would have mercy abundantly upon the repentant sinner who came to him for pardon (Isa. 55:7). But Christ taught that God himself eagerly seeks for the lost and

sinful and at infinite cost to himself strives to bring them back into fellowship with him (John 3: 16; 17: 3; Matt. 18: 12-14, etc.).

It was the same spirit which inspired the life of Christ himself. The degraded and lost were of such immense value to him, as they were also to God, that he lived a life of hardship and humble service, and died a death of cruel shame, in order to save them from disease, misery, and sin. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10: 45). "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Luke 19: 10). "I am the good shepherd, and I lay down my life for the sheep" (John 10: 15).

By such teaching, and still more by his daily example, Christ showed for all time that the more grievous a man's crimes may be, the more earnestly must his regeneration—not his elimination—be sought for and paid for by the blood and sweat of the founders of the kingdom of God. He himself strove to bring, at infinite cost, abundance of life and hope—the full realization of perfect manhood—to the degraded and lost. "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly" (John 10: 10).

In pursuance of this master purpose of his

life, Christ ignored all the gross injustice and insult which the murderous spite of his fellow countrymen brought upon him. And at the end, as he hung on the gibbet, his work wrecked, his cause disgraced, his followers scattered and discredited, his body tortured, his soul unspeakably desolate—he called, not for God's vengeance, but for God's forgiveness upon those who had so cruelly and treacherously done him to death.

But we have not even yet fully fathomed the depth of Christ's "enthusiasm of humanity." We are apt to look upon unselfish and loving service as desirable but somewhat unusual attributes in the citizen of an ordinary state. In many cases such characteristics have even been discouraged by those who were deeply concerned for the welfare of the community, on the ground that they are apt to lead to a fussy interference with the liberty and self-respect of the individual, who—however poor and needy he may be—does not wish to be, and should not be, pauperized and patronized. But in his last great parable Christ laid down the principle that active love and service of those in distress are so essential to citizenship in the kingdom of God that a man's eternal destiny depends, not—as in some other religions—upon correct belief, not upon correct ceremonial ob-

servance, not upon the committing or not-committing of certain definite "sins," but simply and wholly upon his attitude of active service, or of passive neglect, as the case may be, toward poor and distressed humanity. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me. . . . Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." (Matt. 25: 34-40.)

The principle here laid down is absolutely final for the would-be citizen of the kingdom. This is Christ's revolutionary new morality, the law of love, that law which the world has not yet begun to comprehend, still less to follow.

Christ's master ideal—the object of his most intense effort and most consistent self-sacrifice—was a society, a community bound together by the passionate loyalty of common experience of God and by a new and revolutionary ethic, the law of humble service of the poor and lost—service that was not patronage, but genuine friendship. The kingdom was to be the Father-

hood of God expressing itself on earth in the active and redemptive brotherhood of man.

The expulsive power of this new and mighty ideal, the kingdom of God, broke down the racial antagonisms of that age and united men of every race in the Christian community. We may well believe that nothing but the same divine impulse can break down the racial antagonisms of our own age.

VII. The Sovereign Value of the Kingdom of God

The kingdom of God, whose governing ideas we have been discussing, was in Christ's view the greatest of all good things, and its attainment on earth was the only object really worth living for. "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto treasure hid in a field, the which when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field. Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant, seeking goodly pearls; who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it."

Christ clearly regarded citizenship in the kingdom as worth all that a man could possibly give for it. All one's possessions are a cheap price to pay for that boon. In his own case and in that of the friends whom he loved the best, the following of the cause of the

kingdom meant the sacrifice of all worldly ambition, of wealth, of popularity, of home life, and finally of life itself (Matt. 19: 12, 21; 8: 20-22, etc.). Christ embraced this prospect of self-renunciation with the most gallant enthusiasm, in the conviction that the cause of the kingdom, which is the cause of the reconciliation of individual men and of races of men toward each other and toward God, was abundantly and gloriously worth any sacrifice which he could make for it.

In comparison with the interests of the kingdom the most elementary and instinctive requirements of human life, such as the need for food and clothing, fall into insignificance. "Take no thought, saying, What shall we eat, or What shall we drink, or Wherewithal shall we be clothed? For your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." It is a hard doctrine and may well seem to us impracticable and otherworldly. But nothing shows more clearly the spirit which was in Christ, and which in the society founded by him succeeded so marvelously, for a time, in achieving racial reconciliation.

Wherever this same spirit spreads, with its detachment from worldly desires and its sub-

ordination of the material interests of the individual to the good of the whole community, there can be no economic problems acute enough to sever class from class or race from race. The true citizen of the kingdom has his heart so set on the spreading of that kingdom that he has no time left for selfish worries regarding his share of the good things of this world. He cannot even be bothered about the elementary necessities of food and clothing: still less about his duty to supply himself and those dependent upon him with a "respectable competence." He knows that he is God's servant and soldier and that God is fully aware of his material needs. So he leaves the question of supplies entirely in God's hands.

But Christ's conception of the supreme claims of the kingdom of God did not involve an eternity of unrewarded self-renunciation for the faithful servant and soldier of that kingdom. He believed that its true citizens should be rewarded, even in this world, by a satisfaction and a joy which should infinitely outweigh everything that they had suffered and lost. "There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, who shall not receive many times more in this present time—and in the world to come life everlasting." The faith-

ful soldier of the kingdom, stripped, desolate, and despised though he may be, has yet a Comfort and a Strength, given directly to him by his King, which infinitely outweighs the value of all that he has lost. Though he seems to have been robbed of all the good gifts which God has given to men, yet in truth he possesses them all indestructibly and incorruptibly. For just as to be alone, but with God on our side, is to be in a majority: so to be poor and lonely, but with God, is to be rich beyond the dreams of avarice, to be gloriously blessed in a goodly comradeship which far surpasses the best and most affectionate of earthly company.

Moreover, this blessed state of the destitute and desolate soldier of the kingdom shall extend beyond the grave and shall brighten in the hereafter into an eternal life of fellowship with God and with those—the friends of God—of whose friendship death can never rob God, but who after faithful lives on earth dwell with him now perfected forever (Mark 12: 26, 27).

Hence, in Christ's view, the service of the kingdom of God brings with it, not only freedom from earthly care, but also fullness of joy and the assurance of a glorious immortality. No wonder that, so long as the Christian Church believed its Master's words and saw its Mas-

ter's vision, nothing sectional or narrow could stand against that Church.

VIII. The Universality of the Kingdom

It follows, as a necessary consequence of Christ's view of the supreme importance of the kingdom of God, that the claims of that kingdom are superior, not only to all individual interests, but also to the interests of any earthly community, race, or nation. As we have seen, Christ resolutely and definitely rejected the temptation to use the supernatural power which he knew to be at his command for the establishment of the kingdom, whether by means of physical force or by ordinary political methods (Matt. 26: 53; 4: 8-20; Luke 20: 25; John 6: 15, etc.). We have seen also how, in consequence of this refusal, he appeared to his contemporaries to be playing the part of a pious coward, if not that of a deliberate traitor to his country. This was the real reason why they hounded him to death—he would not become a political Messiah of the type they desired. He died for his supra-national and supra-racial ideal of the kingdom of God. He died for the cause of racial reconciliation.

For Christ's conception of the kingdom is essentially universal. The "kingdom of heaven is like unto a net that was cast into the sea and

gathered of every kind." "The field is the world, the good seed are the children of the kingdom." "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations." Such sayings show plainly how clean-cut was the breach between the thought of Christ and the thought of his fellow countrymen, with their fanatical narrow-mindedness and their racial exclusiveness. In spite of his humble origin, Christ has utterly transcended all such pettiness of outlook. The kingdom he has come to found must be world-wide, unaffected by barriers of race or speech or nationality. Its citizens are gathered from far and near, like useful fish caught in a wide-sweeping net, or like grain grown from good seed scattered over a broad field. They are to be gathered in from the whole earth by means of a world-wide proclamation of the good news of God's love. Racial reconciliation has actually been achieved wherever the kingdom of God, as Christ conceived it, has been realized on earth. The master-loyalty of that kingdom has transcended all sectional loyalties. The enthusiasm of its patriotism has expelled all the devils of racial and nationalistic antagonism. But there have been few epochs when, except in the narrowest of circles, the idea of the king-

dom has been given the opportunity to achieve this work of reconciliation.

Closely connected with the idea of the universality of the kingdom is the idea of its capacity for unlimited expansion. Since it is confined by none of those artificial barriers which both limit and consolidate ordinary nations, the kingdom is free to transcend frontiers, demarcation of jurisdiction, language differences, racial divergencies. Hence it may increase as rapidly as good seed in fertile ground, growing from tiny beginnings to great developments, changing all its environment as silently and swiftly as yeast fermenting in dough (Matt. 13).

For Christ knew that any one who shared his own vivid experience of God's love and power would thereby be transformed into a resistless force for the performance of God's work in the world—that is, for the founding of the kingdom of God. Nor should this force always act as silently as the seed or the yeast. "No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins" (Mark 2: 22). The new element which had been brought into the world through Christ's teaching of the kingdom could not be restricted or confined. It would spread resistlessly, sometimes silently, some-

times explosively, transforming the whole earth by its power. Old ideas, customs, and prejudices must vanish before it. It was a ferment introduced into the world which, like Mr. Wells's "Food of the Gods," might for a time work undetected, but would assuredly break forth again and again, perhaps in scattered epochs, perhaps in some great movement and agency of reconciliation. Its "coming" in any given epoch or manifestation might be partial and imperfect only. At times it might seem that nowhere on earth was there a sign of the kingdom. Yet here and there it would assuredly be working, if not socially or internationally, then in quiet homes and hearts devoted to God's service. And finally it must transform the whole world.

History has proved the truth of Christ's anticipations. There have been long periods of slow and gradual transformation, periods in which to a superficial view stagnation may seem to have settled down upon the human spirit, periods even in which it seemed that progress had given way to speedy and disastrous retrocession. Yet all the time the leaven has been at work.

Suddenly there comes an explosion. In a few brief years far-reaching changes are brought about which profoundly affect the

whole spiritual nature of mankind. In reformation or revolution the human spirit breaks free from the shackles which have bound it. All men suddenly perceive that ancient good has become uncouth, perhaps that some institution which once worked for the kingdom has so ceased rightly to perform its function as to be hindering instead of furthering that work. In a day worn-out systems of truth and discipline are destroyed. And humanity liberated from their shackles begins its march anew upon a plane of freedom unimagined before.

A closer study of these great explosive epochs will show that the new up-springing of spiritual life—the new enthusiasm for liberty—would have been impossible save for the steady working of the leaven during the preceding periods of long, dull development, in the Age of Scholasticism, or in the Age of the Benevolent Despots. Even the periods of retrocession may be seen to have had their purpose of usefulness. The dreadful Barbarian Deluge seemed to have destroyed the very foundations of civilization and of religion just when Christianity had conquered the Roman world, but it supplied the raw material whereon was built the interracial triumphs of the mediæval Church. The horrors of the earlier period of the Industrial Revolution supplied the raw material for the

spread of enlightened and co-operative democracy. Even the nightmare agonies of the Great War may prove to have prepared the way for a new internationalism.

But in whatever way its extension takes place, and over whatever area of human life—whether in the political sphere, or in the economic sphere, or in the social sphere—the nature of the kingdom is essentially universal and ever-expanding. Its conquest in one sphere, even in one aspect of the conscience or action of one individual life, is inevitably the prelude to further conquests in the same sphere, and to the extension of its influence over other spheres also. By its very nature the kingdom cannot stand still. The divine Love incarnate, however imperfectly, in its citizens is continually urging it forward to fresh conquests over sin and misery.

Knowing this, Christ unhesitatingly commissioned his inner circle of friends—men who at the time showed scarcely a trace of comprehension of his spiritual messages—to go far and wide through the world in order to convert men to acceptance of the spiritual ideals of the kingdom. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." They were to change men's wills from loyalty to their own selfish interests into loyalty to the interests

of the kingdom. They were to alter the whole basis of human morality; for all men were to be taught to obey the laws of the kingdom—those laws of simplicity, humility, and loving service which are the very nature of the divine Ruler of the kingdom.

Summary of Christ's Program of Reconciliation

We have thus reached a conception of Christ's fundamental program of reconciliation. The root of the whole matter was a vivid consciousness of the reality of a loving and holy God, who values each single man at an infinite worth just because he is a man. This consciousness expressed itself not only in devotion to God, but also in devotion to man—in the enthusiasm of humanity. It carried with it also the unremitting endeavor to make God's will and nature—that is, love—operative in the world. This endeavor, in its turn, implied the founding upon earth of a universal and ever-expanding society—the kingdom of God—of which all in whom God's will operates, whatever their race or nation, are equally members and citizens, being bound together by their common allegiance to God and by the common endeavor to make his love the controlling factor in all human relationships.

These were the ideals, or rather the elements of a profound experience, which for Christ solved all the problems of racial reconciliation, and which can still solve all those problems.

IX. Christ's Method of Friendship

We may now proceed to consider the methods by which Christ, in his contact with individuals, brought into their lives the infinite good things of the Kingdom of Reconciliation. We may hope to gain from the study some conception of the manner in which the concrete problems of racial antagonism, which are so desperately serious in our own day, may be resolutely attacked and practically solved.

As we have already seen, Christ in his relations with any type of man always proceeded from one fundamental principle—namely, that God sets an infinite value on each individual human soul.

He taught that even abandoned sinners are of such incalculable worth to the Heavenly Father that he is continually seeking the lost and is willing to pay the highest of all prices for their redemption. This belief, held with all the conviction of Christ's loving nature, necessarily implied as its consequence the worth of the lost to Christ himself. He knew that his

duty was to bring—at infinite cost to himself—the blessings of the kingdom, which meant abundance of life in every sphere of a man's personality, to those who stood most in need of that life. He therefore devoted himself to the helping and saving of the most degraded and shameless wretches.

This vocation involved in Christ's own case (and he taught that his followers must be prepared to pay the same price) a lifetime of humble service for humanity and finally a disgraceful death. It involved his consorting freely with drunkards, traitors, oppressors of the poor, debauchees, and the broken outcasts of society. It meant his setting at naught the social prejudices of his time: his cutting himself adrift from national traditions and aspirations: his abandonment of respectable and religious associations.

The practical outcome of Christ's attitude toward God and his kingdom, and of his belief in the infinite value of every human soul to God, was a solid confidence in the good inherent in every man. However disreputable any given man might manifestly be, however black his record, however patently unworthy he might appear of any confidence at all, Christ took for granted his integrity and honor. Such unreasonable confidence (as it may well seem to

us) bore fruit in the creation, by a process of suggestion, of those very qualities which beforehand existed only potentially in the man's character, but which Christ's confidence succeeded in calling into active operation. "Diogenes went about with a lantern looking for an honest man. The error of Diogenes lay in the fact that he omitted to notice that every man is both an honest man and a dishonest man. Diogenes looked for his honest man inside every crypt and cavern; but he never thought of looking inside the thief. And that is where the Founder of Christianity found the honest man; he found him on a gibbet and promised him paradise." [11]

God does not love degraded humanity out of mere purposeless sentiment, but because there is in each soul a spark of the life of God —a spark which, rightly cared for and encouraged, may grow into the flame of the unveiled presence of God himself. For in every man there is the capacity to share in the Will of God, the Goodness of God, the Love of God, which is God himself (Matt. 5: 48; John 1: 9; 15: 9 and 12, etc.). Christ appealed unhesitatingly to this capacity, this element of the real life of God in man, by means of his sovereign method of frank and generous friend-

[11] Chesterton, "Charles Dickens," p. 17.

ship. As we shall see, we have in this method of friendship—if method it can rightly be called —for all time the consummate secret of the spreading of the kingdom of reconciliation. Levi (Luke 5: 27-32), and Zacchæus (Luke 19: 1-10), Mary the sinner (Luke 7: 36-50), the thief on the cross (Luke 23: 39-43)—these, and hundreds more like them, were won into the kingdom of God, not by Christ's preaching to them, not even by his teaching them (as far as we can tell), but simply by his friendly confidence in them. He treated them, not as the moral lepers and outcasts that they really were, not by severe rebuke, not by contempt and ostracism till they reformed, but by an unfaltering appeal to the best that was in them, an appeal couched not in language, but in the frank and natural friendliness of his attitude toward them.

Christ appealed to the better selves of such moral bankrupts simply by associating with them on terms of entire intimacy and by accepting their hospitality and their personal services as though he were entirely ignorant of their villainies and regarded them as models of respectability and decorum. True, in the last-named instance, that of the penitent thief, this was impossible, since both the thief and Christ were hanging in their last agony on the

cross. But here, with a splendid and heroic flash of that generous spirit which had always actuated his relations with the wretched and degraded, Christ offers the sinner his own hospitality, invites him to join himself in paradise.

In the case of the woman taken in adultery, where it was impossible to ignore her sin, Christ refrained with matchless courtesy from condemning that sin (John 8: 1-11).

It is clear that Christ's own nature exercised a magnetic influence for good upon those with whom he came in contact, rendering this simple method of friendship extraordinarily efficacious in the winning of men—especially (and this is worthy of careful notice) in the winning of men who belonged to alien and outcast sections of the community. Such men appealed especially to Christ because they were suffering under the weight of that Jewish racial pride which he hated so heartily, and which constituted a problem of racial reconciliation more acute even than any that faces us in the modern world.

Christ associated in unaffected good fellowship with people whom the ordinary society of his race and nation shunned as impossibly disreputable. But in so doing he bated no jot of his own supreme moral standards. He showed sin-hardened men and women,

not by preaching at them, but simply by being friends with them, that their own standards of conduct were odious, while his standards were beautiful and desirable.

In the case of Zacchæus, the attractive power of Christ's friendship compelled the hardened defrauder of the poor, the shameless traitor to his country, who had grown rich on his corruptions, to conform spontaneously to the standards of the kingdom of God, even though —so far as we can tell from the records—no definite suggestion to this effect had been made to him by Christ.

This incident has direct bearing on our problems of racial reconciliation; for the tax-gatherers, although Jews, were ranked by the Jewish leaders of society and religion as low as, or lower than, Gentiles (*cf.* Matt. 18: 17; 21: 31; Luke 5: 30, etc.) and were therefore utterly ostracized from all social intercourse.

The incident of Zacchæus, coupled with those of the call of Matthew (Luke 5: 27-32) and of the visit to the Samaritan village of Sychar (John 4), forms perhaps the most practical and concrete illustration of the working of Christ's method of friendship in connection with racial or semi-racial problems. He proceeded in these cases by one system only, that of free personal intercourse and comradeship.

We see in the incidents in question the influence of a personality which was in itself a gospel of reconciliation. Unconsciously that personality exercises an irresitible power over those with whom the new relationship of interracial friendship was thus established. The barriers were quickly broken down by which the races had been kept asunder. The ideals of these new associates of the reconciling Personality were transformed; and they were turned into citizens—not, be it most carefully noted, of the exclusive Jewish commonwealth, else all Christ's work would have been in vain —but of the universal kingdom of God. In all this there is material of the most vital applicability to our modern problems of reconciliation.

Christ went and stayed in the houses of men of alien race, or worse, of men who had sold their race and nation for money, men whose ethical outlook was as utterly different from his own as is that of a Borneo head-hunter from that of an English pacifist. He even joined in their convivialities, which were indecorous at the least. In so doing he broke entirely with all the caste prejudices, social taboos, religious traditions, and considerations of national prestige, which exercised such a potent influence over the minds of his fellow countrymen. But

he cheerfully faced the risk involved to his own safety and the disrepute inevitably brought upon his cause.

It was the power of this same friendship which, reproduced in the followers of Christ after his death, sent them forth courageously and devotedly to found the universal kingdom of reconciliation in all the world.

There is one more aspect of Christ's method of dealing with men which we must notice—namely, his courtesy. We have already remarked on this in connection with his readiness to share the hospitality of the alien and the debased and with his treatment of the woman taken in adultery. But the records of his life are full of touches showing that his friendship carried with it an unfailing courtesy of demeanor toward any who needed his sympathy and help. In nothing, of course, is this more noteworthy than in Christ's attitude to womanhood. The position of women among the Jews was low. "In Judea, any, even the most frivolous, pretext could be given for divorce. The school of Hillel declared it a sufficient ground of divorce if a woman had spoiled her husband's dinner."[12] "The Jew still prays, 'Blessed art

[12] Walpole, s. v. "Woman," in "Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels."

thou, O Lord our God, King of the Universe, who has not made me a woman."[13] But in this matter, as in so many others, Christ entirely broke with his national and racial traditions. He took pains to teach women the deep secrets of the kingdom. He reverenced them in precept and practice. He taught the inviolability and sanctity of wedlock. "There is no reference made by Jesus to women that is not respectful and sympathetic; he never warns men against women. He draws some of his most delightful parables from woman's work. Jesus's new attitude to women has so reshaped the thought of mankind, and made it so hard to imagine anything else, that we do not readily grasp what a revolution he made—here, as always, by referring to men's thoughts, and supporting what he taught by what he was."[14]

Christ's attitude to women may thus be taken as typical of that courtesy which was an integral and essential part of his method of extending the kingdom—of reconciling men to each other and to God—by means of simple friendship. He treated those whom his countrymen were accustomed to despise and repel with a perfection of unaffected courtesy and sympathy.

[13] Glover, "The Jesus of History," p. 131.

[14] Glover, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

There is no exaggerating the necessity for this same courtesy in any work of racial reconciliation undertaken to-day. Too often such work, begun, perhaps, in a deep spirit of zeal and devotion, is entirely ruined by a failure to appreciate the necessity for a meticulous attention to courtesy, especially to minor points of courtesy, in dealing—for instance—with an Oriental race. "The very same (English) man who would give his life to keep (Indian) people alive in a famine might behave to an educated Indian in a manner which could not fail to wound and be unconscious of anything wrong."[15] Unfortunately, this is profoundly true; and the risk of racial estrangement from such causes is becoming greater and greater every day, as India progresses in education and racial self-consciousness. Courtesy and gentleness of demeanor go a very long way indeed toward preventing racial friction and toward removing the grounds of such friction once it has come into existence. On the other hand, the absence of such courtesy increases a hundredfold the difficulties of reconciliation. As the late Metropolitan of India declared, after more than thirty years' experience in this country: "I can think of priests of our own

[15] Bevan, "Indian Nationalism," p. 66.

communion, perfectly genuine, hearty, bluff men, who might very likely do admirable work in one of the colonies among our own kinsfolk, where their want of refinement and breeding and good manners would not be so much noticed, but who for Indians are simply impossible men, outraging the Indian instincts of courtesy and good manners at every moment of their lives. For men of this type, be their honesty and desire to serve the Lord what it may, we have no place whatever in India."

The attempt to define the method of Christ in dealing with the problems of racial reconciliation with which he was faced thus resolves itself into the endeavor to recapture a spirit of friendship. Christ loved men because he loved God. The love of God expressed itself through him in a matchless power of simple friendship. This friendship brought reconciliation.

To the theologian or the philosopher this whole scheme of thought may seem thin; so feeble indeed and fashionless as to be scarcely worthy of attention at all. But in truth such friendship as the friendship of Christ for Samaritans and taxgatherers, friendship rooted in an enthusiasm for men which in its turn is founded on an enthusiasm for God, is infinitely the most effective means of racial reconcilia-

tion. We may put it more strongly still. *There is no way to true reconciliation except by friendship and no way to true friendship except by an enthusiasm for God that expresses itself, as with Christ, in an enthusiasm for men.*

X. The Practical Application of the Method of Friendship

Christ's method of friendship demands a genuine willingness to subordinate one's own dignity and opinions to those of one's friends. This is an exceedingly difficult matter for an Englishman, for instance, to bring himself to accomplish in relation to an Indian. His racial characteristics being what they are, he finds it hard to avoid taking upon himself the responsibility of correcting other people's mistakes. Undoubtedly this national trait has been of the highest service in building up the British Empire, and so in conferring upon subject populations and upon the world at large the various and highly important benefits which that Empire has conferred. But it may be gravely doubted whether this feature of racial character has not been a grievous handicap, instead of an advantage, in the building up of the kingdom of God in India.

Our Lord's sketch of the ideal Christian

nature, as given in the Beatitudes, is glaringly inapplicable to the characteristics of many Europeans in the East. The retiring and unaggressive type of virtue commended by him is profoundly un-Western, profoundly Oriental. Yet if Christ's friendship, reincarnated in ourselves, is to have its opportunity of solving the problems of racial reconciliation in this great country, the type of character which Christ immortalized in those Beatitudes must be reproduced in every one, European or Indian, who cares for the cause of reconciliation.[16]

1. The heralds of reconciliation must be "poor in spirit," willing to suffer slight and aggression, willing to forgo the vindication of their own reputation against calumny, willing to allow their much-regarded systems to be wrongly worked, willing to see mistakes made without rushing officiously to correct them. "Poverty of spirit is the opposite of pride, self-righteousness, and conceit; the spirit of the publican rather than of the Pharisee; the spirit of those that wish to learn rather than to teach, to obey rather than to command, and are will-

[16]It may not be out of place to quote once more the well-known remark of an educated Indian: "The Englishman has inherited the earth: but if you were to call him meek he would be insulted."

ing to become as little children in order to enter the kingdom of heaven." [17]

One essential outcome of poverty of spirit is an enthusiasm for according liberty to others. There is in most Anglo-Saxons, and especially, perhaps, in religious Anglo-Saxons, a highly-developed timidity about letting men of other races loose from the apron-strings of white control. We are afraid that they will make serious mistakes if they are permitted liberty to direct their own affairs in Church or state. We, therefore, keep them in a position of subordination and tutelage till their exasperation passes the limits of their self-control, whereupon we still refuse them their freedom on the ground that they have used illegitimate methods of endeavoring to obtain it.

But the friendship of Christ cannot for one moment endure such a system of control. The whole scheme of existence in which such relationships can exist is alien and impossible to it. It trusts its friends with the fullest responsibilities of self-control and self-determination, because it knows that no virtue is worth a straw which is imposed from without, and that no character is genuinely moral which has not been struggled for in a condition of complete

[17] Dummelow's "Bible Commentary," p. 639.

self-determination. "The vital and distinguishing characteristic of a moral person is autonomy. When that is lost, man is no longer a person, but is a mere inanimate creature. That independence is the singular, the unique quality of a person, and in any relation between persons where, on either side, this is ignored the relation becomes less than personal. All free and noble and right relations between men, on the contrary, depend on keeping it sacred and inviolate on both sides and in all aspects of life. . . . The autonomy of a moral person consists in being self-determined according to its own self-direction in its own self-conscious world. No succor that would be personal may ignore this central characteristic of the moral person. Every day we are reminded of the impossibility of truly helping people except through themselves." [18]

These are golden words for the guidance of every worker for the kingdom of God in the sphere of racial reconciliation. We must be possessed by a passion for liberty, on behalf, not of ourselves, but of others. It must be a passion which renders us uneasy so long as any shred of servility or dependence on the one hand, or of patronage and paternalism on the

[18] Oman, "Grace and Personality," pp. 38, 39.

other, remains to mar the intercourse of free persons.

The gospel of Christ's friendship is the perfect gospel of reconciliation, because it is also the gospel of liberty—of a passion for conceding freedom to others, of a passion which is founded ultimately on the conviction that all men are equally children of the one loving God, whom to know is life eternal.

"Poverty of spirit" must thus be expressed in a willingness to grant complete liberty in every sphere to the members of an alien race. This must be liberty, if need be, to make mistakes, even disastrous mistakes.

2. Again, the ambassador of racial reconciliation must be "meek," genuinely willing to take a position of subordinate dignity and responsibility, while his friends administer, perhaps inefficiently and wrongly, the institutions and systems which he has laboriously and painstakingly built up. This in itself, the Christian law that "we must decrease, but they must increase," is a lesson bitterly hard for the average Westerner to learn. It is possibly even harder for the missionary than for the non-missionary, in proportion as the former cares more vitally for the work on behalf of which—believing it to be the work of God—he may have sacrificed position, prospects, and family ties.

The above Christian principle is illustrated in the recent movement for establishing autonomous Churches in those countries where evangelical missions have been at work for more than a generation. Dr. O. E. Goddard, Administrative Secretary for Foreign Fields, Methodist Episcopal Church, South, who recently assisted in setting up the autonomous Methodist Church of Mexico, says:

"The final objective of all missionary endeavor in foreign fields is to establish a self-governing, self-perpetuating, and self-supporting Church. Every missionary we send out, every institution we build, every piece of literature we create—all that we do in sharing the gospel with disadvantaged nations should keep this ultimate objective in view.

"In the first stages of the work the native peoples are passive, receptive, obedient. If we do the work well, there will come a time when the workers whom we have trained can begin to assume some of the responsibility for the ongoing of the work. In the course of time we have more trained native workers than we have foreign missionaries. At this time we begin to discuss autonomy or independence. The nationalistic spirit begins to assert itself and to make some demands. We can no longer superinduce a foreign program in full.

"The genius of the nation must be taken into consideration. The home Church needs now more wisdom, more diplomacy, more generalship than she has ever needed before, perhaps.

"Shall we suppress the nationalistic spirit? No. Shall we temporize with it? That is a doubtful policy, offering at best but temporary relief. Shall we grant them complete autonomy with our financial help and continued co-operation? The mother Churches answer, 'Yes.' "

Those who know the traditions of the Indian public services must be convinced that the good men will not fail her at this time and that there will be found in them that essential basis of Christian character without which it cannot be hoped that they, who have been the masters so long, will take up the more necessary and more glorious rôle of the true public servant. "No glory of conquest can parallel the glory of such self-limitation of having lifted and upheld a broken nation till it could stand and go upon its own feet." [19]

3. Again, the ambassador of reconciliation must "hunger and thirst after righteousness." At present we generally do our hungering in this respect on behalf of other people. We de-

[19] Bevan, "Indian Nationalism," p. 140.

sire intensely that others may attain to the high moral standard of which we ourselves are such admirable examples. But we must learn to be less anxious about the morals of others, and to do our hungering for ourselves, that we may learn what Christ meant when he laid down that terribly unattainable standard of his, "This is my commandment, That ye love one another as I have loved you." Again, we must learn what this means, "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not unto me." We must hunger and thirst after a capacity for practical friendship such as Christ himself consistently evinced.

4. Again, the herald of social reconciliation must be "merciful"—in the sense that he must be ready to excuse moral weakness and grave transgressions of his own ethical code. The average Anglo-Saxon cannot see his code seriously infringed without something akin to physical nausea, or at least a genuine and noble indignation. Yet racial reconciliation will never be achieved till we learn our Master's patience and mercy toward his friends. Christ's mercy was shown in his patient teaching of, and unchecked fellowship with, his disciples, even though their spiritual ideals and their moral outlook differed *toto cælelo* from

his own. So it must be with Christ's representatives to-day. While clinging resolutely to their moral ideals so far as these affect their own conduct, they must be "meek"—incapable of adopting a censorious or patronizing attitude on account of their possession of those ideals—and they must be "merciful"—willing to forgive and to overlook a thousand transgressions against those ideals. They must never swerve either to the right hand or to the left, either toward a cooling of their own personal allegiance to their ideals or toward a breaking of friendship with those whose practical following of the same ideals differs from their own.

5. Again, the ambassador of reconciliation must be "pure in heart"—that is, he must never imagine evil in another man until it is clearly and unmistakably proved that he is corrupt (and after that he must still be merciful). As we have seen, Christ's method was to take men and women—even grossly immoral men and women—at their best. He appealed to the nobility and purity which he knew to be hidden somewhere within their nature; and he did so simply and surely by his matchless method of friendship. He ignored the dark side of their nature. He forbore to condemn it even when, as in the case of the woman taken in

adultery, it was roughly forced upon his notice.

It is true that there was one class of people whom he condemned scathingly; but they were just the respectable and moral men of his day who refused to have anything to do with those who were socially and morally so needy. Such Pharisees were condemned, not for sin in the ordinary sense, but for their aloofness, their pious self-sufficiency, their intolerant conceit.

Christ's purity of heart is shown by his unwavering confidence in the divine potentialities in those who were ostracized and outcast, and by his unhesitating appeal to those potentialities, even in the basest—the method of that appeal being nothing but his friendship.

It is better to be deceived and hoodwinked a thousand times over than to lose this essential element of Christ's enthusiasm of humanity—his ability to hope against hope, and to believe against proof, in the essential goodness and lovableness of the men with whom he dealt. The success of all our work of reconciliation, and indeed it may be added the saving of our own souls, depends upon our maintaining unsullied our conviction of the ultimate integrity and beauty of the characters around us.

This is not to say that sin should be condoned or glossed over, any more than Christ

condoned or glossed over the sin of those with whom he associated. If our friendship is of the right quality, the mere fact of that friendship and the unspoken influence of our lives, working through quiet example and the attractiveness of genuine affection, will check and destroy sin and will achieve a transformation which any spoken words would hinder rather than help. This is the way Christ's friendship worked for the condemning and combating of sin; and so it must be with us, if we would truly continue his work.

6. Again, we must "mourn," in the sense of a genuine sharing in the sufferings of others. Too often those who live in the midst of a poverty-stricken and ignorant population are so continually surrounded by human misery that they allow themselves to become hardened to it, regarding each new evidence of the suffering around them merely as a fresh "case." Those who allow this habit of mind to gain control over them are in a fair way to lose the capacity for the friendship of Christ. And then, however zealously they may devote themselves to the service of the need around them, that service will be in vain. For nothing can atone for the absence of love, and love alone can make us truly mourn with those that mourn.

From the point of view of racial reconciliation it is better for an ambassador of reconciliation to save, with genuinely loving friendship and sympathy, half a dozen victims of sin or misery than for him to devise some highly efficient but impersonal system, whereby thousands are benefited. For in the latter case those with whom he deals will merely be lifted one step upward in a life wherein love and reconciliation toward God and man may find little place: while in the former case the few friends he has been able to make will in themselves become centers of dynamic effort after reconciliation and friendship. In the first alternative the friendship of Christ is given effective play. In the second, personal friendship is replaced by a mechanical organization, whose very hugeness and efficiency cuts out the possibility of true sympathy, of the affectionate personal interest which "mourns with those that mourn."

7. Above all, the herald of reconciliation must be a "peacemaker": not only in the sense that he must be constantly at work for the mitigation of racial antagonisms: not only in the sense that he must endeavor perpetually to bring together clashing interests, to patch up quarrels, to break down barriers of class and caste, language, nationality, and race; but in a deeper

sense also. His peacemaking must be positive, not merely negative; for he must be possessed by a passion for unity between man and man and between man and God. He must be so filled with the friendship of his Master and with his enthusiasm for the God who is the equally-loving Father of all mankind, whether Oriental or Occidental, laborer or capitalist, good or bad, that he will unconsciously spread around himself an atmosphere fatal to the existence of all antagonisms and all divisions, an atmosphere in which every man who comes in contact with him shall recognize the petty folly of hatred and slander, of self-aggrandizement and spitefulness and intolerance.

As more and more lives are conformed to Christ's ideals, and lived in his spirit of friendship, so, and so only, the problem of human relationships will be solved.

"Then, in such hour of need,
Of your fainting, dispirited race,
Ye like angels appear,
Radiant with ardor divine.
Beacons of hope, ye appear,
Languor is not in your heart,
Weakness is not in your word,
Weariness not on your brow.
Ye alight in our van! at your voice,
Panic, despair, flee away.
Ye move through the ranks, recall
The stragglers, refresh the outworn,
Praise, reinspire the brave!

Order, courage, return.
Eyes rekindling, and prayers,
Follow your steps as ye go.
Ye fill up the gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On, to the bound of the waste,
On, to the City of God."[20]

[20] Matthew Arnold, "Rugby Chapel."

Date due.

DATE DUE

BT 590 .F7 H69 1930

Hoyland, John S. 1887-

The teaching of Jesus on human relations

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN
BT590.F7 H69 1930
Hoyland, John The teaching of Jesus on h
3 0645 0008 1310 1

The Teaching of Jesus on Human Relations

BY JOHN S. HOYLAND

THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS on human relations have been perhaps the hardest for his followers to learn and to apply. Nations still war with nations; one race fails to understand another race, and they clash; political, industrial, and commercial greed manifests itself regularly and its subsequent disturbances scream from newspaper headlines much too frequently. There is a most helpful and sensible optimism to this work by Hoyland. He writes with his eyes open, the facts before him, and the conditions well analyzed. Especially well does he write of the Orient, now so greatly in turmoil.

He turns us again to the teachings of the Master. He challenges us to live more understandingly with each other—family with family, nation with nation, race with race. In short, he calls upon us to be one in Christ, and through loving him to love each other.

Price, 50 cents

COKESBURY PRESS
PUBLISHERS OF GOOD BOOKS
NASHVILLE TENNESSEE